BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. III. **April, 1906.** **No. 2.**

A STUDY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY PROFESSOR HENRY C. VEDDER, D.D., CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

To master any piece of literature, no single method of study suffices. At least two methods must be pursued, neither to the exclusion of the other, since they are complementary. One is to study the whole in the light of the details—a method commonly called exegesis. The other is to study the details in the light of the whole, and is often called exposition. It is perhaps a matter of no great importance which method is first employed, provided the other is not neglected; for there can be no accurate exposition without careful exegesis, nor truthful exegesis without thorough exposition.

This study of the Fourth Gospel is avowedly expository. Let us at the outset brush aside all questions regarding authorship, time and place of composition, and the like—not contemptuously, as things of no importance, but as irrelevant to our present purpose. That purpose is simply to inquire, What does this Gospel tell, and why? Here is a piece of literature. Somebody wrote it. Let us give him the traditional name of John, and seek to discover his purpose and message. For that the book, in its present form, is the product of a single mind, and was composed with a definite purpose, can be doubted by no reader who has any competence for literary criticism.

What does this Gospel tell? The theme is announced in the opening sentences to be the Word; the Word that was with God in the beginning, and that was God; the

Word through whom all things were made; the Word that is the Light of men; the Word that was made flesh and tented among us, in order that he might declare to men the invisible God. There is no need of a wearisome and bewildering discussion of the Logos-doctrine of Philo, and what John may have borrowed from Alexandrine thought, and for this reason: In spite of the library of learned nonsense, and the modicum of learned sense, that has been written on this subject, it is by no means certain that John had ever heard of Philo and the Alexandrine philosophy. There is no conclusive evidence that he either knew or cared anything about the speculations of Neo-Platonism. His use of the term Logos, or Word, to describe the pre-existent Christ might well have been quite independent of any philosophic speculations. It is a metaphor that might suggest itself to any thoughtful man. A man's word is that by which he communicates himself to others; it is the expression, the revelation, of his thought, feeling, will. A man's word is the man himself. So the Word of God is God, and at the same time he is the revelation of God's will, feeling, thought. The Word is God in creative energy; he is God coming into relation with the world he has made; he is Light, he is Life, he is Truth. And the complete revelation of God to man was attained when the Word became flesh and lived the life of a man, under human conditions and limitations. "No one has ever seen God—God only-begotten, he that is in the bosom of the Father, he declared him." This does not mean that the Word was transformed into man, the divine into the human; nor that the divine became contracted to the limits of the human and so was indistinguishable from it; but that the Word assumed human nature—became mysteriously, yet really and indissolubly, united to a human spirit, clothed with a human body—so that in Jesus of Nazareth men beheld God manifest in the flesh.

The Fourth Gospel is, therefore the Gospel of the Incarnation. And the fact of the incarnation is thus made

primal, central, not for any dogmatic reasons, but to impress duly upon us the lesson of that incarnation: By assuming man's nature, the Word has identified himself with man's state, obligated himself to share man's burdens, to bear man's penalty. Those who come into fellowship with him enter upon the same path of lowly service and vicarious suffering. The same mind must be in them that was in the Word, who emptied himself of his divine glory and power, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and became obedient unto death.

This is the Gospel of the Incarnation, not only in that it reveals the wondrous fact of the Word becoming flesh, but because it describes in detail the earthly life of the incarnate Word. That life is briefly characterized in 1:14: "And the Word became flesh and tented among us, full of grace and truth; and we beheld his glory—glory as of One Only-begotten from the Father." The entire Gospel is an expansion of that sentence. The earthly life of the Word is said to have been "full of grace and truth"—"grace," the spiritual condition of one in whom God dwells, and who is therefore completely governed by the divine will and is in full accord with the divine character; "truth," exact outward correspondence in word and deed to a perfect character, which exists in God himself chiefly, and in all God's servants according to the measure of their fellowship with him. Accordingly, in Jesus Christ men beheld "glory, as of One Only-begotten from the Father"—a unique and absolutely perfect excellence, a being not only without sin (that would be merely negative) but possessing and manifesting all those attributes of personal character that we associate with God himself. To justify this description of the historic Christ is the aim of the Gospel.

Two other and minor aspects of the earthly life of the Word are set forth in the Prologue:

1. He came to his own (Israel), the chosen people of God, and they did not receive him (i. 11). This prepares us for the details of Christ's rejection by the official heads

of the nation, the chief priests and Sanhedrin; by their recognized religious teachers, the scribes; and by the exponents of their highest type of piety, the Pharisees. It prepares us also to find that the scene of the Gospel is mainly Jerusalem, where alone this appeal to the nation's representatives could fitly be made.

2. But some received him, both of his own people and of the Gentiles, and to such he gave power to become children of God, for in him was Life (i. 12, 4). We may therefore expect to find this side of the ministry of the incarnate Word fully set forth.

This is what the Gospel has to tell. The purpose of the writer in telling it he has himself explicitly declared: "These things have been written that you may believe Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." The author did not set out to write a biography, but a Gospel. He was convinced, however, that he could best accomplish his purpose of securing belief on the part of his readers by telling how Jesus Christ had manifested his uniquely perfect character—that to relate those things in the life of Jesus which had elicited faith in those who saw and heard would elicit like faith in those who read. Those who have eyes to see would behold the beauty, the majesty, the perfection of his character; they would believe and receive life.

This purpose of the author is told in several different ways. "I have been born for this," said Jesus to Pilate, "and for this I have come into the world, to testify to the truth"—the truth, namely, that he was King, Messiah, Son of God (xix. 37). The mission of Christ is thus defined by himself to have been essentially that of testimony, witness-bearing, the declaring of God to man. In the Prologue also this word is found, and further study shows it to be the key-word of the Gospel: μαρτυρία, testimony.* Either as noun or as verb this word is in

*One other word of frequent occurrence in this Gospel, though by no means unique, is σημεῖον, sign, the visible way in which the witness is borne.

constant use, while it is of rare occurrence in the other Gospels. John the Baptist came into the world to bear witness to the Light, to give his testimony to the Messianic office and character of Jesus. The Word became flesh that he might become God's witness, declare God to men. The book was written in testimony to the words and work of Jesus, that men might believe him to be the Christ, the Son of God.

To sum up: as to substance, this is the Gospel of the Incarnation; as to form, this is the Gospel of Testimonies.

As to literary form, the Fourth Gospel is the most regular, the most artifical (in the good sense of that word) of the four Gospels. Its structure or plan is simple and easily seen, and is striking because of its symmetry. Certain numbers—three, seven, ten, twelve—had a special religious significance in the mind of a Jew, and the number seven seems to have had a peculiar attraction for John. The contents of his book are arranged in three main divisions (there is probably no significance in the number three), each of which is subdivided into seven heads or sections, as will appear from the following.

ANALYSIS.

Prologue, i. 1-18.

I. Testimonies and Manifestations of the Early Ministry.

1. Testimony of John and his disciples, i. 19-51.
2. First "sign" at Cana, ii. 1-12.
3. Cleansing of the Temple, ii. 13-25.
4. Conversation with Nicodemus, iii. 1-21.
5. Second testimony of John iii. 22-36.
6. Jesus manifests himself in Samaria, iv. 1-42.
7. Second "sign" at Cana, iv. 43-54.

II. Testimonies and Manifestations to the Jewish Nation.

1. Healing of the lame man, v. 1-47.
2. Feeding of the five thousand, vi. 1-71.
3. Jesus at the Feast of Booths, vii. 1-viii. 59.
4. Healing of man born blind, ix. 1-x. 21.
5. Jesus at the Feast of Dedication, x. 22-39.
6. Raising of Lazarus, x. 30-xi. 54.
7. Jesus publicly assumes title of Messiah, xi. 55-xii. 50.

III. Manifestations and Testimonies of the Last Days.

1. Jesus manifests himself at the Supper, xiii. 1-30.
2. Last Discourses to his Disciples—the coming of the Comforter, xiii. 31-xiv. 31.
3. Discourse continued—Union with Christ, xv., xvi.
4. The Prayer of Jesus, xvii.
5. The arrest and trial, xviii. 1-xix. 16.
6. The Crucifixion and death, xix. 17-42.
7. The Resurrection, xx.

Epilogue, xxi.

I.

First of all, then, we have a group of seven events, conceived either as testimonies borne to the divine Sonship and Messianic mission of Jesus, or as manifestations of his "glory," his uniquely perfect character, in the earlier part of his ministry. The Gospel begins (i. 19) almost as abruptly as the Gospel of Mark, with the testimony of John the Baptist and certain of his disciples. Knowledge of the preliminary work of John, and its results among the Jewish people, is assumed by the author. This work has created such a stir that the national authorities can no longer ignore it. They send a deputation to John, who demand from him an account of himself and a declara-

tion of his authority. He frankly confesses that he is not the Christ, but only his forerunner; but to their demand for his credentials he gives what must have seemed to them a vague and enigmatic, if not evasive, reply.

On the very next day (if we are to construe literally this note of time) the Baptist bears public testimony to the Messianic character and divine Sonship of Jesus. The baptism of Jesus we must understand from i. 32-34 to have previously occurred, but though John at that time recognized the Messiah in Jesus he had not then opportunity to bear his testimony. He now announces that he has beheld the divinely appointed sign of the Spirit of God descending upon Jesus in the form of a dove and remaining on him, and by this he knows Jesus for the Lamb of God, for him who should baptize in the Holy Spirit. But this was to John more than a mere sign of identity: he recognizes and testifies that in this descent of the Spirit Jesus had received the reality of which the holy oil was but a symbol, and was now become the Anointed One, the Messiah, the Christ. With this formal public attestation of his official character, Jesus begins his ministry.

With John on that day are two disciples who are, like him, waiting and watching for the coming of the promised Deliverer. Hearing the words of their master they follow Jesus, and at his invitation spend the rest of the day with him. What a day of days it was to them! How every incident of it must have remained photographed upon their memories to their latest breath. From that interview they are the devoted followers of Jesus—they become his disciples as they had been John's.

One of these men was Andrew; the other, unnamed—who can he be but the author himself? Andrew, in his new enthusiasm, goes in search of his brother Simon, bursts upon him with these words, "We have found the Messiah," and brings him forthwith to his new found Master and Teacher. Jesus, who needed not to be told what was in any man, beheld in Simon not only the man

he was—impulsive, headstrong, fickle, a strange compound of bravery and cowardice—but the man he would become by God's grace—the leader, the pillar, the tower of strength to his brethren and their common cause—and gives him a new name, expressive of this new character, Kephas, Peter, Rock.

The next day Philip is called to be a disciple, and at once accepting the invitation goes to his friend, Nathanael, the Israelite in whom there was no deceit, who, though doubtful at first, is persuaded to see Jesus, and recognizes him for what he is. Though we are not told this in so many words, we may be sure that John would not be long in finding his brother James, and with him six of those who are to be the Twelve closest disciples have already heard and answered their call. These instances illustrate, and were probably recorded to illustrate, the eagerness with which a select few choice souls, who were prepared by previous spiritual experiences to understand Christ, instinctively perceived his unique character and mission, joyfully welcomed him as one to whom they were drawn by irresistible affinity, and confessed with Nathanael, "Teacher, you are the Son of God, you are King of Israel."

The author now goes on to relate the first public manifestation of his "glory" by Jesus—the first "sign" to the world of his character and office—the miracle of turning water into wine at Cana. What the effect upon the guests may have been we can guess, but we are not told; what we are told is that his disciples were led by this manifestation of himself to give him their whole trust. They had already recognized his exalted character from his words to them; this deed confirms their intuitions. It shows Jesus, as the Christ of God, to be the source of life, King of the physical world as of the spiritual, as far above men in power as he is in character and dignity.

After a brief stay at Capernaum, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem. This ministry in Galilee John passes over in almost complete silence, not because it was in his view

unimportant, not because it is fully described in the other Gospels and so need not be told again, but because it is not germane to his purpose. He has set out to tell the story of Christ's appeal to the Jewish nation, and his rejection by its official and spiritual heads. For the same reason he tells us of but one incident of this visit to Jerusalem—the one that exactly fits his theme and purpose. Jesus goes to the Temple; he is outraged by the flagrant abuses that have grown up; before his authoritative manner, before his flaming indignation, the conscience-stricken brokers and dealers flee in dismay. This assumption of authority, this manifestation of moral power, were strictly appropriate for the Messiah, and were a tacit assertion of his official dignity. It was so understood by priests and Sanhedrin—for by "the Jews" John always means either these official representatives of the nation, or their unofficial religious leaders, the scribes and Pharisees—and they instinctively assume a hostile attitude to this new prophet and teacher. They demand of him a "sign," that he shall work a miracle to attest his right to such exercise of authority. Jesus refused then, as always, to perform a miracle for the convincing of the hostile or incredulous. Nor will he explicitly declare himself to be the Messiah, and thus precipitate the fate that is finally to overtake him.

Though no other acts of Jesus during this visit are narrated, it is easy to gather that John is not silent because there was nothing more to tell. Other "signs" that Jesus did are mentioned, and the fact is recorded that many believed on him at this time—which things show that his ministry here was of some duration and included both teaching and miracles. That he made a profound impression in Jerusalem, both upon the people at large and upon their leaders, is evident. At least one of the leaders was favorably impressed by the teaching of Jesus and desired to know more about him, and accordingly came to him for a private, personal conference. His coming by night may have been due in part to a pru-

dent wish to avoid comment—he was not yet an avowed disciple, and may not have wished to identify himself too closely with a teacher already under suspicion of the authorities. Quite as probable is the conjecture that he came by night, because Jesus was thronged all day by the people, and night offered the only opportunity for a private and prolonged conversation, such as he desired. To Nicodemus Jesus imparts two principles fundamental in his teaching: First, that his kingdom is spiritual and consequently natural birth gives no one entrance into this kingdom. Jew as well as Gentile must undergo a profound spiritual change before he can become a subject of the King. And secondly, he makes clear his atoning work, his redemptive mission. Because his sacrifice was so immeasurable, his exaltation is so matchless—the way of lowliness, of service, of death, is the way of greatness, of glory, in his kingdom.

While we have no definite information regarding the length of this stay at Jerusalem, we may plausibly guess that it was not more than a few weeks at most. It must have created great excitement, and even exposed Jesus to the danger of immediate arrest. We may read these things between the lines, as the reason for his going into the rural districts, where there would be less excitement and danger of interference. He continues to teach and make disciples. His success was so great that the jealousy of certain disciples of the Baptist was roused; they come to their Master complaining that he is in danger of eclipse. John again bears most emphatic testimony that Jesus is the Christ, of whom he has claimed to be only the forerunner. There is no room for jealousy in the great heart of the Baptist; he knows that his work is nearly done. Henceforth he must decrease and Jesus must increase, and he rejoices that such is the case.*

The Pharisees continue their opposition, and Jesus

*The paragraph iii, 31-36 is probably to be regarded as an interruption of the narrative, and a comment by the author, not as a part of the words of the Baptist—though this is not altogether certain.

thinks it the part of prudence to leave Judea for a time. On the journey, at Jacob's well, he meets a Samaritan woman and converses at length with her. Three principal themes are found in this discourse: (1) Jesus declares himself to be the Water of Life, the source of spiritual power; (2) he makes clear the nature of genuine worship, that its essence is not in time or place or ritual, but in the relation of man's spirit to God, who is Spirit; (3) he first explicitly declares himself to be the Messiah. What he would not tell to hostile unbelief at Jerusalem he discloses to simple faith in Sychar. For several days he tarries in the town, and many believe on him there. It is easy to see why John relates this episode: it is, in some respects, the most striking of all the manifestations of the "glory" of Jesus. A hated Jew, the power of his character and teaching are so convincing that multitudes give him their entire trust. There could be no more emphatic contrast between the faith of these Samaritans and the unbelief and rejection of the Jews. To make that contrast as vivid as possible is the writer's evident object.

Which ought a religious teacher to regard as the greater failure—to elicit no faith from a part of his hearers, or to rouse a wrong kind of faith in another part? In Judea, in spite of having created a great *furore,* Jesus had on the whole been coldly received, suspected, rejected; in Galilee men received him favorably because they had heard of his signs and wonders at Jerusalem. Only in Samaria did his message find a ready acceptance for its own sake, for its intrinsic worth. It is perhaps because of this attitude on the part of the men of Galilee that John elects to tell but one incident of the early ministry there. He evidently chose this one, not because it was not told in the earlier Gospels, but because it was a striking manifestation of the "glory" of Jesus, inasmuch as it called forth faith of a peculiar quality, such as he did not often find in Galilee or elsewhere. It was natural that this royal officer should seek Jesus—a journey of twenty miles or so—a father in such case will leave noth-

ing untried. What was not to be expected was the officer's instant and entire confidence in the mere word of Jesus, a confidence that next day he found to be fully jusified. Such faith was peculiarly grateful to Jesus. Every man would rather be valued for what he is than for what he can bestow. The faith that sees in Jesus the chiefest among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely, is surely dearer to him now, in his exaltation, than the faith that sees in him only the most willing and bountiful of givers—though he may not repudiate the latter sort of faith, and may honor it more that it deserves. In his first "sign" at Cana, Jesus had shown himself lord of the forces of nature that minister to the needs of man. Now he shows that his lordship is such that he can heal disease. But who can do this except one that has power also to minister to minds diseased, to heal sickness of soul as well as of body?

II.

Here, with the second main division of the Gospel, begins a series of seven distinct and direct appeals to the representatives of the Jewish nation, all but one of which are made in Jerusalem. These appeals are arranged in a rising scale, a *crescendo* of interest and power. Four of them have their starting-point in the performance of a notable miracle, or "sign," and in each case the miracle is followed by an address or sermon.

The first of the incidents is the healing of the lame man at the pool of Bethesda. His lameness had been caused by sin; the man had become hopeless of cure. What a type of sin and its results! for sin is paralysis, sin is the maiming of all our powers, sin is a hopeless condition apart from divine healing. This healing, which took place during an unnamed feast, was a sign of undeniable power, but nevertheless gave occasion for a charge by the Pharisees that Jesus had violated the Sabbath. We see how rapidly unbelief hardens into opposition. In his dis-

course, Jesus shows how absurd the charge of sacrilege really is, but this only in passing; his main purpose is to announce his divine Sonship and the proofs by which his mission is authenticated. The Jews rightly understood him to claim equality with God, as his real ground of justification in the course he was pursuing. His mission, he declares, is to honor the Father by doing his works. God is the source of Life, but he has given to the Son power to make alive. God is Judge, but he has committed all judgment to the Son. This is not inconsistent with the declarations of Jesus elsewhere (iii. 17; viii. 15) that he did not come into the world to judge the world. All hearing of the gospel is necessarily a judgment; men either accept the truth and find life or they reject it and continue in death. A testing, winnowing, self-judgment of hearers is inseparable from the teaching of truth. In short, the Son is the revelation of the Father, he has come into the world to declare God to man. This mission is authenticated by three lines of proof: (1) the testimony of John; (2) the testimony of the works; (3) the testimony of the Scriptures. If they really believed Moses and the prophets they would believe Him; their rejection of Him proves that they did not really believe Moses or understand the Scriptures. They could not believe Jesus because their ideals were earthly, as they showed by preferring the applause of men to the honor of God.

It was desirable that at least one appeal should be made to the Pharisees and leaders of Galilee. The second notable miracle, the feeding of five thousand, was made the occasion of such an appeal. In the synagogue at Capernaum Jesus delivered a long discourse, in which he explained the spiritual significance of that miracle, and made clear the manward aspect of his mission. He had come into the world that men might have life—had come to satisfy their hunger with the bread of life. He was himself that Bread—in him was to be found the satisfaction of the spiritual hunger of men, and only those that feed on his flesh and drink his blood, that is become par-

takers of his nature, receive eternal life. To a material mind, the figurative way in which this teaching was given would naturally seem grossly material, and so we need not wonder that the Jews "murmured" (discussed, complained, criticised in a hostile spirit). It is more surprising that some of his disciples declared such teaching to be intolerable, and that from that day many who had hitherto professed discipleship turned away from him.

This was the crisis of his work in Galilee. Those who sought material blessings, those who had political aspirations, fell away, unable to receive a teaching so spiritual, caring nothing for a kingdom not of this world, or for food that did not nourish the body. But the Twelve, and some others doubtless, remained faithful. With Peter they believed that Jesus had words of eternal life, that his words and works avowed him to be God's Anointed One. He satisfied their deepest spiritual wants. Yet already Jesus could see in Judas signs of that defection which was to come.

The remaining appeals to the nation were made in Jerusalem. The authorities generally say that John is the most precise in his chronology of all the evangelists, which is true in a sense, though it is also true that John does not care a button for chronology. What he shows us is that Jesus made his appeals to the nation in connection with the great national feasts; partly because he had greater opportunity to present his teachings at those times, partly because the crowds then present were a protection to him. The Sanhedrin did not venture for some time to risk the disapprobation of the multitude by arresting him during a feast. Again and again we are told that he would have been summarily dealt with by that body but for this fear of the people, in whose eyes Jesus was a prophet.

The feast of booths afforded an excellent occasion for teaching the multitudes, and making an appeal to the scribes and Pharisees. Jesus declined to be moved by his brothers' taunts to make a demonstrative entry of the

city and a public proclamation of his Messianic character. A few months later, at the passover feast, he did this; and the result was his speedy death, as he had foreseen. Not to provoke such an untimely fate, while his work was still but half done, he now goes up quietly, but teaches publicly in the Temple. The authorities and leaders were astonished at his teaching, indeed perplexed, because he had not been a pupil of any Rabbi and belonged to none of the recognized schools or parties. But already among the people the question was anxiously discussed whether this teacher were not in truth the Christ. Enraged by this, the Pharisaic party in the Sanhedrin sent officers to arrest him, but these were so impressed by the teaching that they returned without their prisoner, saying, "No man ever talked like this!"*

What had so impressed them? A discourse in which Jesus declared that he was soon going wither they could not come, and because they did not believe his teaching they would die in their sins. He also declared more plainly than ever before his divine authority for his teachings: "He that sent me is with me. He has not left me alone, because I always do the things pleasing to him."

On the last day of the feast the teaching of Jesus becomes more emphatic; he promises the Water of Life; he declares that he alone can make men free. There is a tone of unusual sharpness in his denunciations of "the Jews" (some Rabbis apparently had engaged in controversy with him), for he now says they are not children of Abraham at all. The Jews could not receive him because he was not their ideal of a Messiah; and they had such an ideal because they had become alienated from God and so misunderstood the Scriptures. In conclusion, Jesus makes what every Jew would understand to be a

*The protest of Nicodemus on this occasion against this inequitable action of the majority of the Sanhedrin brings into clearer relief the fact that most of that body were now not merely opposed to Jesus, but determined to silence him—which, of course, could be effectively done in only one way.

claim of divine nature, "Before Abraham was, I am." They attempted to stone him on the spot for blasphemy. The rising tide of opposition is almost ready to overwhelm Jesus—the people are beginning to join their leaders.

The healing of the man born blind, which seemingly happened during this visit, deepens the intensity of feeling. It is symbolic, like all of the miracles of Jesus, and the discourse following in the Treasury of the Temple made clear its meaning. Jesus is the Light of the world; he has come to dispel the darkness, to cure the moral blindness that sin has caused. But he has also come for "judgment," for testing and sifting men. Those who, like the Pharisees, are not conscious of their need of healing and insist that they see, must remain in their darkness and guilt. The Jewish leaders not only could not receive this teaching, but they had the blind man whom he had healed expelled from the synagogue, because he proclaimed his trust in Jesus as the Christ. Persecution quickly followed rejection.

Passing over the intervening time without comment, John comes to the feast that commemorated the Dedication of the Temple. Again Jesus makes his appearance in Jerusalem and teaches in the Temple, this time in Solomon's colonnade. "The Jews" challenge him to tell frankly whether he is Messiah or not, but he does not permit them to force him into a premature declaration of himself. Yet he gives an implicit declaration of his office and work, in the allegories of the Good Shepherd and the Door; and he closes his discourse with the announcement that he and his Father are one. Again the Jews make a demonstration of stoning him, for what they regarded as blasphemous words, but he shows that the Scriptures which they accepted as God's word contained precedents for such language.

Escaping an attempt to arrest him, and judging that the excitement and opposition had become too great for him to continue his teaching in Jerusalem, he went for a

time to Perea. From now on he teaches only those who come to him of their own choice, for instruction. Luke has given us a very full account of this part of his ministry. Chapters xi. to xiii. of the third Gospel are given to this subject, and contain among other things the discourse on prayer, the parables of the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward and the Pharisee and Publican, as well as the incident of the rich young ruler. John merely says that many came to him at that time and believed.

This Perean ministry was interrupted by the greatest of the miracles of Jesus, the raising of Lazarus. The key to the chapter describing this event and its consequences is given us in the words, "I am the resurrection and the life." This "sign" again discloses Jesus as Lord of all things, including life and death, as the one in whom alone men have hope of eternal life. The miracle in the flesh was wrought only to turn men's minds to the miracle in the spirit that he was equally able and equally ready to work. But instead of this, it merely embittered his enemies and precipitated the long-preparating catastrophe. Jesus foresaw the consequences—the final rejection of his claims by the Jewish leaders, who, instead of being convinced by the truth of his teaching, were infuriated by his success, to the point of including Lazarus with Jesus in their scheme of vengeance. It was knowledge of this stiff-necked opposition, as well as the faint faith of his closest disciples, that made Jesus so indignant in spirit as he approached the tomb of Lazarus, and drew from him tears that the bystanders incorrectly interpreted as evidence of his great love and grief for his friend. He was not grieving for the dead Lazarus, but for living sinners, whose fixity of unbelief and malignant opposition cut him to the heart.

They had scornfully rejected him without taking pains to comprehend his teaching. He was not the sort of Messiah they were looking for, so in their eyes he was an impostor. But they greatly feared that his miracles would lead the people to accept him, and that a revolt

against Rome would be the natural consequence—a revolt certain to be unsuccessful and to be punished by a still further loss of their liberties. There was, therefore, (granting the validity of their premises) but one prudent course to pursue; to suppress this false Messiah, before worse mischief should be done. Their culpability lay in the fact that they had not even attempted to understand Jesus and his teachings; had they done so, their fears would have been shown to be groundless. Jesus was put to death in complete misapprehension of his aims, but if they had understood him better would the Jewish leaders have believed in him more readily? Nothing warrants an affirmative answer.

After the raising of Lazarus, Jesus again goes across the Jordan, to await the passover, when he will make the final manifestation of himself and complete his work. At the proper time he goes up to Jerusalem. Jesus may have made no appreciable impression on the Jewish leadears, he may have made less impression on the people than his large following would suggest, but at any rate he had a small company of intimate friends and disciples in whose hearts he was enshrined forever, in whose love and fidelity he could unquestioningly trust. His friends are the measure of his "glory." The story of the supper at Bethany is therefore told by John for its own sake and in its proper order, while the other Gospels tell it out of its chronological order, merely to explain the treason of Judas. The anger of this unworthy disciple at the rebuke of Jesus no doubt precipitated action that he had perhaps long secretly meditated.

On the following morning Jesus makes his entry into the city. The news of his coming has preceded him, and disciples came forth to welcome him. If there has been a steadily growing unbelief and hostility among the ruling classes, there has also been a rising tide of belief and enthusiasm among the people. The enthusiasm of the crowd leads them to make a considerable demonstration, and Jesus does not check them. The time has come for

him to declare himself unmistakably, and he accepts the title of Messiah as his of right when the acclaiming crowd confers it on him.

When he reaches the Temple, Jesus finds certain Greeks desiring to see and hear him, and he hails this as proof that his work has culminated, his mission is accomplished, since his fame has gone beyond the narrow limits of Judea. Henceforth nothing remains but to fructify by his death the truth he has been teaching. He leaves the Temple with his work on earth completed. His few remaining hours of life belong to the inner circle of his disciples, that he may impress himself as deeply as possible on their consciousness and prepare them to become his Apostles and witnesses.*

III.

Eight chapters—nearly half the entire writing, exclusive of Prologue and Epilogue—are devoted by John to the last manifestations and testimonies of Jesus. The greater part of this matter is peculiar to John, and even when he describes scenes and events that are narrated in the other Gospels with sufficient fulness for biographical purposes, the point of view from which he writes is so novel and the end he keeps in mind is so distinctive, that he is invariably led to give fresh incidents and illuminating details. We see this in the very first of the seven subdivisions of this part—the account of the last supper. Of the supper itself John says little, and of the institution of the Eucharist he says nothing at all—an omission that at first seems unaccountable and incredible, until we remind ourselves once more of his main object in writing, and then we see why he tells us only the one incident of Jesus washing the disciples feet. This was the supreme manifestation of Jesus' love. While his disciples were disputing which should be greatest in the kingdom, and

*The paragraph, xii, 37-43 is another pause in the narrative for an explanatory remark by the author.

striving which should have the seats of honor at table, he performs this menial service—not to teach humility, as is so commonly said, but to teach love, as he himself says (xiii. 1): the love that he actually had for his disciples, the love that they should have for each other (xiii. 12-17). He thus says to them in symbol, what he soon after says in word, "This is my commandment, that you love one another, even as I have loved you."

In the conversation at the supper, we have one of the purely personal touches that are a part of the charm of this Gospel. John alone tells, as he alone of the evangelists knew at first hand, of the by-play between himself and Peter regarding the betrayer of Jesus. For tradition cannot be wrong in its uniform maintenance that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is to be regarded both here and elsewhere as no other than John himself."*

After the departure of the traitor—smarting at the knowledge that his treason is now known not only to his Master, but to at least two of his fellow disciples, and burning to accomplish his evil purpose and receive his reward—Jesus begins the most tender and impressive of all his discourses. All that he says may be naturally classified under two topics: Union with Christ, and, The Coming of the Comforter. Let us disregard the exact order of the text and consider his words in their connection of thought.

We may then conceive the discourse as beginning with ch. xv. and the allegory of the Vine (xv. 1-8). From this Jesus passes to the New Commandment that he is about to leave with them (xiii. 34, 35), and the subject is continued in xv. 9-27. Union with Christ, as of the branches with the vine, a union whose proof and manifestation are furnished in their mutual love—this is the topic of the

*How finely, let us note in passing, John has sketched the character of Simon, with a few masterly strokes: his self-confidence, his obstinacy, his great heart, his dangerous impulsiveness. surely, Surely Simon has much to learn before he can become Peter, the Rock.

discourse. Studied in the light of this dominant idea, each verse easily yields its meaning.

The other topic, The Coming of the Comforter, to which transition is made in xv. 26, 27, is continued in xvi. 1-11 and 16-33. Then we return, for its further discussion, to xiii. 31, whence the discourse moves on to xiv. 29, to which should be added xvi. 12-15, and as the conclusion of the whole, xiv. 30, 31. If these discourses are read in this order, it will be seen that they are much more coherent and impressive, and that the meaning of each sentence becomes far clearer.

One can hardly miss the purpose of the author in so fully repeating to us these discourses. They are the crowning manifestation by Jesus to his disciples of his "glory," his unique character. Only the incarnate Word could thus intimately speak of his Father; only the incarnate Word could declare that "he that has seen me has seen the Father;" only the incarnate Word could speak of "the Comforter, whom I will send you." As these promises gave a new idea of their Master to the disciples who first heard them—an idea that never ceased to deepen and broaden—so the permanent record of them, it seemed to John, could not but give readers for all time a truer idea of the real character of Jesus Christ.

And now, having finished his instructions to his disciples, Jesus pours out his whole soul to his Father in prayer. This chapter xvii. is the most wonderful chapter of the Bible, for by admitting us to the privacy of his communion with his Father, our Lord has taken us into the very Holy of Holies. This is commonly called "Christ's Intercessory Prayer," and the title is so far justified as this: Jesus does in this prayer make intercession for his disciples, present and to be. But this is to name the prayer from a single element in it, and that not the most important. The chief thing in the prayer is not Christ's concern for his disciples, but Christ's relation to his Father. His work on earth is finished, he is standing (so to speak) by his open grave,

he is in the very article of death, and under these circumstances he solemnly commends to his Heavenly Father himself, his work and his followers. Far more appropriately than to the prayer given by Matthew and Luke the name of the Lord's Prayer might have been given to this outpouring of our Lord's inmost heart. The other prayer should be called the Disciples' Prayer. It is, of course, hopeless to think of changing a usage that has so rooted itself in Christian literature, but we can at least remember that this is the real Lord's Prayer, and so think of it.

And as to its substance, let us note that it is largely communion with God, soul to soul, heart to heart. It is not mainly petition. Petition has its place in this, as in all prayer, but here its place is distinctly subordinate. Communion, fellowship—that is the essence of prayer. If we come to God only to seek gifts from him, even spiritual gifts, we have not yet learned the nature of true prayers.

Upon the three testimonies of the arrest and trial, the crucifixion, death and burial, and the resurrection, it is not necessary to dwell. The author's purpose is evident in each case; the bearing of Jesus under this supreme test, the proofs of his divine nature that he continually gave, correspond to the general theme and round out the account of the incarnate Word. The words and incidents that John alone reports—we may note especially the incident of "the doubting Thomas"—are such as precisely suit his purpose to let the greatness of Christ's character speak for itself. He was right in believing that Jesus is himself the most convincing argument for the truth of Christianity, as generations of readers of this Gospel have discovered and testified.

With ch. xx. the Gospel proper ends, but who would wish omitted the Epilogue and its personal reminiscenes? It is the most touching manifestation of the character of Jesus in the whole book, his unbounded love and mercy, the forgiveness that could restore Peter without rebuke

(save one delicately hinted), to his place of primacy and influence among the apostles.

Who that is not blind to all spiritual verities can fail to see that this Gospel has told the story of a life that continually revealed "grace," "truth," "glory"—a glory as of One Only-begotten of the Father—a character so completely unique that it is explicable only as John explained it: Jesus of Nazareth was not only Son of Man, but Son of God, the Word made flesh.

ARISTOTLE'S THEOLOGY.

BY W. W. EVERTS, M. A.

Aristotle, called by Plato the mind of the school and by Dante the master of those who know, may be said to have made "science his forte and omniscience his foible." His father, Nicomachus, physician at the Macedonian Court, and his pupil, Alexander the Great, supplied him with means to collect books and specimens of every kind. Raphael, in his famous fresco of the school of Athens, represents him as the investigator looking down upon the earth while Plato is represented as the dreamer, looking up into Heaven. Plato called him the reader, and said that he needed the check as much as others needed the spur.

Aristotle followed the scientific and historical method in his researches. Beginning with a statement of his theme he then gave a historical review of the treatment of the subject by others, afterwards stated the difficulties, doubts and contradictions suggested by the subject, then sifted, discussed and explained them, and finally gave his own solution of the problem, much as Dorner does in his "Glaubenslehre." In this manner he studied the cosmos, man and God. It is unnecessary to name the sciences whose foundations he laid, as he invented the nomenclature and outlined the scheme of nearly all of them. The philosopher's tools were forged for him in Aristotle's work-shop. Suidas calls him "the secretary of the universe." Hegel says "he penetrated the whole universe of things." Sir William Hamilton found the seal of the peripatetic philosopher on all the gates of knowledge. St. Hilaire reckons all before the Stagirite only his precursors, and all after him only his disciples. Cuvier was astonished at his knowledge of the animal kingdom; Lessing started with his æsthetics, and

Kant with his categories. Hegel found logic where Aristotle had left it. He was as familiar with the habits of ants as with the social life of man. He wrote more than four hundred treatises. He studied the constitutions of 158 Greek cities in preparing his Politics, a book that Thomas Arnold knew by heart.

It is safe to say that Aristotle had the gift of analysis in perfection; he has been well called an "anatomical, critical, descriptive and classificatory genius." In contrasting Aristotle with his great teacher, Goethe likens the younger man to an architect who draws an immense circle for the base of his building, collects materials from all sides, arranges them, piles them up in layers and so rises in regular form like a pyramid to the sky, while Plato seeks the heavens like an obelisk, or better, like a pointed flame.

It need not occasion surprise, if with so many subsidiary sciences to elaborate Aristotle did not take the time needed to study all religions and thus to discover the best. His works on "the Good" and on "the Ideas" are lost, and we are compelled to depend on incidental references to theological questions scattered through his works. Theology had a place in his encyclopædia, but it was not treated by him as fully as the other sciences were. He may have neglected it intentionally, for to judge from what we know of his character, he was not a devout person. No statue of him is extant. The bust in Palazzo Spada in Rome represents Aristippus, and, if it were his, it would convey no information concerning his character, as the head is gone. But, if we may trust contemporary epigrams, the philosopher was a thorough-going man of the world. He was called a gourmand. His stature was small, his legs were thin, his head was bald, his lips curled in a mocking way, his beard was short; he was always well-dressed, his fingers were covered with rings and he lisped. Such a person might be expected to treat religion, if at all, in a condescending fashion, as it was afterwards by Montaigne, Voltaire and

Gibbon. However, Aristotle was not lacking in the nobler traits of character. He refers in his will to his mother and his wife, long since deceased, in most affectionate terms. While he denied the chief tenet of Plato, the existence of ideas, he nevertheless always venerated his teacher and declared that it would be profane for a bad man even to praise him.

In my search for references to deity in the writing of Aristotle I have found his metaphysics and his Nicomachean ethics most helpful. Naturally metaphysics and ethics come nearer to theology; however, I have found in various other books occasional allusions to my theme. I have arranged the quotations under the following heads: Omnipotence and eternity, omniscience, design and first cause, benevolence, blessedness, unchangeableness and the divine image.

I give first what the philosopher has written on the omnipotence and eternity of deity.

It may seem that there is no eternal essence separate and subsisting by itself. This, however, is absurd, for it appears to the most elegant minds that there is such an essence. But how can an eternal essence be the principle of things both eternal and not eternal? The existence of God is eternal and perfect, a life everlasting. We say that God is a living being eternal and the most excellent so that life and duration, continuance and eternity are present with God, for God is this. We should separate from mythology the point that the first and deepest grounds of existence are gods. The world did not spring out of Chaos. There is an eternal and immutable existence, an actuality prior to all potentiality, a source of motion itself unmoved. How could matter be moved if there were no power to move it? The matter of a house does not move itself. God's action is immortal and this is perpetual life; there is perpetual motion in God. Since there is that which is moved, that which moves and that which subsists as a medium between these, there is something which moves without being moved, which is eternal

essence and energy. The first mover attracts that which is attracted and through that which is moved it moves other things, hence he is a necessary being. The first of all is the mover of all, the first mover is God. If movement is eternal, there must be something eternal, too. Movement being continuous this something, which is one, must be eternal. The quintessence is the eternal cosmos beyond earth, water, air and fire. We are accustomed to give to the extreme and highest place the name of heaven, which we call the seat of all which is divine. The sky is a kind of divine body; the stars are far more divine than man; the souls of the stars are God's.

"Imagine men who have always dwelt beneath the earth in good and well illuminated habitations, habitations adorned with statues and paintings and well furnished with everything which is usually at the command of those who are deemed fortunate. Suppose these men never to have come up to the earth, but to have learned from an obscure legend that a deity and divine powers exist. If the earth were once to be opened for these men so that they could ascend out of their concealed abode to the regions inhabited by us and if they were to step forth and suddenly see before them the earth and the sea and skies and perceive the masses of clouds and the violence of the winds; and if then they were to look up at the sun and become aware of its magnitude and also of its workings, that it is the author of day in that it sheds its light over the entire heavens; and if afterwards when night had overshadowed the earth they were to see the whole sky beset and adorned with stars and should contemplate the changing by night of the moon as it waxed and waned, the rising and setting of all these heavenly bodies and their course to all eternity inviolable and unalterable; truly they would then believe that gods really exist, and that these mighty works originated with them."

Here follow some passages that treat of the first cause, the design and the omniscience of the great spirit.

Whoever thinks there is need of a God has to think that there are gods. God seems to be a sort of beginning of *causes* and God possesses the knowledge of causes. All kinds of knowledge are more needful than this but none is better. The principle of things eternal must be always true for they are not *sometimes* true, nor is anything the cause of their being, but they are the causes of being to other things. Essences should be without matter, for it is necessary that they should be eternal if there is anything eternal. Essence cannot possess any magnitude but it is indivisible. It is divinely said that the first essences were God's. The first intelligent substance to all eternity itself possesses intelligence of itself.

He understands himself if he is the best of all things and if intellect is the intellect of intellect. God's blessedness consists in thinking on thought. He who bids the law to be supreme makes God supreme. Law is intellect free from appetite. Anaxagoras says that man is the wisest animal because he possesses hands. It would be more reasonable to say that he possesses hands, because he is the wisest animal, for it is more reasonable to give a flute to a flute player than to confer on a man who has some flutes the art of playing them. To the creature fitted to acquire the largest number of arts, nature assigns the hand, the instrument useful to the largest number of purposes. "The universe is like an army. The good of the army consists in order and in its commander who is the good of the army in a still greater degree; the commander is not on account of the order, but the order on account of the commander. The same immovable uncreated nature always chooses the best in all cases and being is better than non-being. God and nature make nothing superfluous. God has completed the whole by rendering generation continual. Perpetual production is as near *being* as possible. As the eyes of bats to the light of day, so is the intellect of our soul to such things as are naturally the most splendid of all. It is unworthy not to seek that knowledge which is appropriate to God. Science may be

godlike in two ways, godlike because it is that thing which God hath above all others, or because it is itself, the knowledge of the divine. Some have thought that besides other manifold goods upon earth, there is some absolute good, which is the cause to all these of their being good. But we may dismiss the idea at present for if there is any good universal and generic or transcendental and absolute it can neither be realized nor possessed by man, whereas something of this latter kind is what we are inquiring after. The cobbler, the carpenter, the physician and the general all pursue their vocations without respect to absolute good."

The next group of passages centers around the benevolence of God.

The good is the good of all production and motion.

If the gods take any care for men, as they are thought to do, it is reasonable to suppose that they delight in that which is best in man and most akin to themselves and that they regard those that show greatest regard and reverence as caring for that which is dear to themselves and as doing rightly and nobly. It is plain that all these things are found most of all in the wise man. The wise man therefore is the most beloved of heaven and therefore we may conclude the happiest. Homer very properly calls Jupiter father of gods and men, as he is king of all.

When there comes to be a great distance between persons in virtue, vice or wealth, or in any other respect, they no longer are or expect to be friends. It is most plainly seen in the case of the gods, for they have the greatest superiority in all good things. Given a being very far removed as God, and there can be no friendship. It is always supposed that the gods are of all beings the most blessed and happy, but what kind of action must we ascribe to them? It is ridiculous to conceive of the gods engaged in trade, can we conceive of them as facing danger? To whom are they to give? It would be an insult to praise them for having no evil desires. In short if we were to go through the whole list, we should find that all

action is petty and unworthy of the gods, and yet it is universally supposed that they live, and therefore that they exert their powers, for we cannot suppose that they all sleep like Endymion. Now if a being lives and if actions cannot be ascribed to him, still less production, what remains but contemplation? It follows then that the divine life which surpasses all others in blessedness is contemplation.

Many passages deal with the adorable blessedness of God.

"That which intellect appears to possess as divine belongs more eminently to the first intellect than to ours, and his contemplation is the most delightful and the best. If God always possesses that excellent condition of being which we sometimes possess, it is admirable, but if he possesses it in a still higher degree it is still more admirable. In this manner however he subsists. Life also is energy, essential energy is his most excellent and eternal life."

The unchangeableness of God is set forth unmistakably. "He is without passion and unchangeable. The heavens that are moved are simple, without beginning or end and immutable. That by which they are moved is still less subject to change for it is first of first, simple of simple, indissoluble of indissoluble and ungenerated of ungenerated. If that which has a body is changeless, much less can that which has no body be changed. The parts may be regarded as changeable, but the whole cannot change, it is increate and indestructible."

Aristotle seems to have drawn from man's intellectual grandeur the inference that he must be made in the image or of the nature of God.

"Man's life is happy as far as it resembles the divine state of mind. The life of God is of a kind with those higher moods, which with us last but a brief space, it being impossible that they should be permanent, whereas with him they are permanent, since his ever present consciousness is pleasure itself. A life which always follows

the reason is something more than human, for it would be the expression not of man's nature, but of some divine element in that nature. If then reason is divine, the life which consists in the exercise of reason will also be divine."

"The intellect seems to have something divine. If the mind were capable of perfect energy we should be as God. The soul is not a body neither is it without a body. The soul may be the realization or perfection of the body as the sailor of the boat. The highest function of the soul is not inherent in the body, and has no special organ with which it is connected like the other functions. It is an emanation from the celestial sphere and is the only part of the soul which survives the death of the body. Death destroys those potentialities that result in happiness. Whether forms remain after separation must now be considered. Is soul a thing of this kind? Not indeed every soul, but intellect, for perhaps it is impossible that this should be the case with every soul. Can Solon have meant that a man is happy when he has died? This would be an absurdity since we consider happiness to be energy. No one desires to remain in all respects the same when he grows older. With God this may be, for God is already in complete possession of the good. As the stories tell us, superlative excellence raises men to be gods."

What conclusions as to the theology of Aristotle can be drawn from these quotations? In the first place it seems he was a deist. He believed in an absentee deity, one who planned the machinery of the world, set it going, and then left it to itself, a being who was good in the philosophical sense, who had a good mind, but gave no thought to anything but himself, an inactive, a self-contemplative being, a being to be admired, worshipped and imitated, and yet without affection for men, a being who is the quintessence of order and beauty, who stamps his law on the constitution of everything in nature, but never bows down his ear to hear the cry of his creatures, who never utters a word of comfort, never extends a hand to help; a being in the

abstract; a principle without a name; a cause without an effect; a force not prior to matter; an unrelated idea; a first form; pure, immaterial actuality, moving, not by creation, for he remains ever unmoved in his own eternity, but by attraction as just ideas and beautiful objects always awaken desire in those beholding them. God is an actual principle, the eternal principle of development, not its product. The formative principle in him is not confronted as in man by an alien matter which can be overcome only after a long and painful struggle. He is the clear dry light of abstract existence. He is the God of animated nature, of Hylozoism rather than of Pantheism. He is an egoist of the transcendent kind, the personification of theoretical reason.

Aristotle's view has been stated in the figure of a sorites thus: There is no extension without time; there is no time without motion; there is no motion without unrealized desire; there is no desire without an ideal; there is no ideal but thought thinking of itself, thought that cannot interest itself in the affairs of men. The God of Aristotle is like the picture of the clock-maker on the wall facing the great clock of the Cathedral of Strasburg; rather he is like a spectator looking forever at himself in a mirror. He is pure intellect separate from feeling and will; the God of logic rather than of philosophy; an interrogation point, a question that, like Plato, Aristotle was always postponing and then answering yea and nay. He confesses that man is blind as a bat before the most splendid things. Now he agrees with the most elegant minds that there is a separate eternal essence. Then he dismisses the conception of a universal general, transcendent and absolute good, because such good cannot be realized or possessed by man. He denies that there can be any friendship between men and gods because men are so inferior to them. But he teaches that it is by the immediate apprehension of the highest truth, by beholding the highest truth, that man gains a participation in that pure thought in which the essence of the deity con-

sists. This beholding, this wishless absorption in the perception of the highest truth, is the most blessed experience of life. This theoretic life is the immortalizing of man. This life according to the divine in man renders him like the divine.

Again we may say that Aristotle believed in final causes. He established the cosmological proof of the existence of God. As illustrations of this argument, you may recall the comparisons which he draws between the world and a house or an army, showing that one needs an architect or a general as well as the other. Then he lays down the broad generalization that nature makes nothing superfluous, but always chooses the best. There is something admirable in all the handiwork of nature. The world is not disconnected like a poor tragedy. It is as beautiful and good as it can be. Matter is under the sway of reason. Throughout his writings he identifies God with law, order, beauty and intelligence. Reason is the ruling and guiding principle within us through which we form our conceptions of what is noble and divine. Whether this be intrinsically divine or only the divine in us, its appropriate activity must be perfect happiness. Such a life is more than human and man can only partake of it through the divine principle within him. He traces the human mind to the divine and considers the original superior to the copy. In the fragment portraying the heavens, a fragment preserved to us by Cicero, he anticipates the apostle's declaration that "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead."

In reply to the query, Was Aristotle a monotheist? we may say with Grant the translator of the Ethics: "It may be doubted whether in his own mind Aristotle ever succeeded in arriving at entirely definite results. It was to a first cause that Aristotle did homage. When we use personal language to describe the deity of Aristotle we feel that it is improper and unsuitable even if he resorts

to it himself. To be sure he quotes Homer approvingly, where he says that 'the domination of the many is not good' and then he applies the poet's words to theocracy and affirms that 'one must be supreme,' but we cannot attribute to that one anything more personal than Parmenides had discovered in absolute being, or Anaxagoras in absolute mind, or Plato in the idea of the good. Personality connotes more than being, mind, and the idea of the good. It embraces feeling and will, qualities which Aristotle explicitly excludes from his notion of deity." Prof. Blaikie thus sums up the limitations of the mind of this great philosopher. "His intellect was complete in all the categories of scientific cognition and strongly marked with all the sagacity which belongs to the man of business. His mind was radically different from Plato's. It was curious, while Plato's was inclined to lofty speculation. He was devoted to the analysis of things small and great, while his teacher thought out grand and beautiful harmonies. He had cultivated acuteness at the expense of wonder. The analytical work of mere understanding is an inadequate method of reaching the highest forms of vital reality. Intellectual culture can never produce a complete and healthy manhood; some flowers are without flagrance; some souls are without piety. Devotion is of the finest aroma of the emotional life. The omnivorous lust of knowledge stunted the growth of the most delicate emotions. In the Ethics the god or rather the gods are alluded to in several places, but merely in the form of a passing remark, as a pedestrian may pick up a primrose and throw it away. This is the great defect of his ethics." St. George Mivart reminds us that in the accummulation of natural knowledge, men's minds have been deadened to spiritual truth. "At the end of abstractions," Dr. Goetz observes, "nothing remains but a mechanical principle of motion. Of God, the one, personal God, author and creator of the visible universe, nothing was heard in the Lyceum." "The Ethics fail," Bishop Hampden says, "in elevating the heart

and the mind to objects which it needed divine wisdom to reveal and a divine example to realize to the life." Revelation is necessary, Milton shows, if governments are to stand the shocks of time. Herein to our prophets far beneath,

> "As men divinely taught and better teaching
> The solid rules of civil government,
> In their majestic unaffected style,
> Than all the orators of Greece and Rome.
> In them is plainest language and easiest learnt
> What makes a nation happy and keeps it so,
> What ruins kingdoms and lays cities flat.
> These only with our law best form a king."

Practically Aristotle was a polytheist, although he speaks of a first principle and a first cause, he sees no incongruity in believing in gods many and lords many. He favors the worship of idols for the sake of the people. To his mind attention to the service of the gods is more important for a city's welfare than food, arts, arms and revenue. Myths were invented by the lawgivers, he says, so as to please the masses. He knew the self-contradition contained in idolatry, for he said "If you deem the sea goddess Leucothe a mortal you should not offer sacrifice to her; if you deem her divine you should not lament for her."

Nevertheless, he adopts immemorial custom and declares that our ancestors were right when they regarded the stars as gods. He located the gods in the farthest circle of the heavens and he argued to himself, the stars, being so much nearer the gods than we are, must be more divine.

He assigned divine souls to the stars because he could not otherwise account for the force that moved them in their various orbits around the central earth. Like his master he cleared the character of the gods of the charge of immorality, but he did not reduce their number. He had an idea that the gods stood originally for the powers

of nature, but he believed in doing honor to the powers of nature.

When the gospel came it swept away Aristotle's idols but it yielded to his philosophy. When Luther arose he found Christendom following the Stagirite rather than the Nazarene. Galileo was imprisoned for disputing the twice holy philosopher. The books of *the* philosopher, as he was reverently called, were treated as infallible. It is a wonder that he was not canonized. The Franciscans and Dominicans were fierce rivals under Duns Scotus and Thomas Aquinas but both followed the metaphysics of Aristotle. The whole world, Mohammedan as well as Christian, bowed to his sceptre. In recent years the pope has re-established Aquinas as the standard in theology, and Aquinas' teacher, Albert Magnus, was nicknamed the ape of Aristotle. Calvin inherited from the schoolmen as the schoolmen from Aristotle the thought of God as a being without love. Luther cried out: "God has afflicted us on account of our sins with this cursed, haughty, rascally heathen." But he cried in vain. Melanchthon prepetuated his rule in German theology where a second era of scholasticism prevailed until the days of Schleiermacher. The idea so long prevalent that God is outside, not inside the world, is traceable to Aristotle. The first of the 39 Articles that describes God as without parts or passions comes from the same source. Descartes' famous argument for the existence of God which runs in this way "A perfect being must exist because we can conceive it, existence being involved in the idea of perfection," this argument is suggested by the words already quoted: "whoever thinks there is need of a God has to think that there are gods." Kant uses the same argument when he drops the rational proofs of the existence of God and appeals to the needs of the soul. Ritschl with his value judgments, holding that the idea of God is a valuable idea and we must hold to it for that reason, is the last one to use Aristotle's dictum. When Spinoza declared that extension is the other side

of thought, he put in different phrase Aristotle's announcement that the world is the body of God. When Locke planted the empirical philosophy with its offshoots in the scepticism of Hume and the atheism of Diderot, he selected as a seed from the granary on the Lycus, the saying, the mind is like a tablet, on which nothing has been written. When Paley gave his well known story of the watch as an illustration of design in nature, he might have found a better one in the hand which Aristotle had selected for the same purpose. When Richard Rothe magnified the absolute, he got the word as well as the idea from Aristotle, and finally Mrs. Eddy with her denial of the existence of an evil principle in the world can appeal to Aristotle for support. In recapitulation I would say that while Aristotle appears to teach the natural and some of the moral attributes of God, that while he appears to be a deist if not a monotheist he is actually a dualist, accepting the eternity of mind and of matter, and a polytheist assigning powers to various deities in different spheres. While it is impossible to exaggerate the contributions which Aristotle made to the physical and intellectual sciences, it is difficult to define what benefit if any he conferred on theology. We might wish that he had sailed to Egypt, as his teacher had before him, for then he would have found in Alexandria a colony of thousands of Jews, any one of whom could have taught him what he had been seeking so long. "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin."

But it was not so to be. God seems to have kept this wise man as an example of the feebleness and nothingness of the most exalted intellect in the search for God, to prove as Aristotle himself admitted that man is as blind as a bat before the most splendid things, to prove that man by wisdom cannot find God.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.*

I. Chapters i.-vi.

BY W. T. WHITLEY, M. A., LL. D.

Fellow of the Theological Senate.

Some books leap into instant popularity and circulate by hundreds of thousands. Some win a position as classics and are reprinted for centuries. Others fall nearly flat at first appearance, and only obtain recognition at a later crisis. To this third class belong some of the masterpieces of literature, which come late to their own, but come then to stay. Spinoza penned such a book, which was not appreciated till Matthew Arnold popularized his doctrines two centuries later. A like experience had befallen two other tracts by men of his race, known as the epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews. Romans lay really neglected for fourteen centuries, translated and copied indeed as part of a conventional body of literature, but not forming opinion or regulating practice. Then arose a great Saxon and discerned in it the systematic exposition of one great doctrine needed in his day, Justification by Faith. And since then a large part of the Christian world has exalted this to a foremost position.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has been waiting longer for its discoverer and expositor; but the message that it bears is one for this age. The foundation of faith is laid secure; the question is whether Protestants will be content to lay that over and over again, and incur the rebuke of becoming dull, or whether they will press on unto perfection. Others have reared on that foundation an elaborate

*This article will be followed by two others from the pen of Dr. Whitley, covering in the three the entire Epistle to the Hebrews.—Editor.

system of ritualism replete with priests and sacrifices; the need to-day is to test that edifice with the plumbline of this epistle, when it will prove falsely built. "No sacrifice since Calvary, no priest other than Christ" is a watchword fatal to much error, ancient and modern too.

The attempt will be made here to show briefly what this epistle taught, and the situation it discloses in a certain Christian circle; to comment on some of the implications in its argument, and especially to expand and apply the main thought to the situation of to-day. Considerations of space make it needful to deal with the epistle in three articles; it is therefore the more needful to say a word or two first as to its perfect unity and artistic design. The only other treatises in the Bible that can compare with it in this respect are the Gospel and Revelation of John. From both of these it differs; on the one hand it interweaves many religious phrases endeared by the familiar version of the Bible, and indeed embodying many lengthy quotations; on the other it is in a style both pure and elevated, betokening a literary master. Yet no book seems more intensely Jewish, in its choice of a narrow field of argument and in its appeal to Jews at one crisis of their history.

ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE.

A birds-eye view of the whole epistle may be taken. The three paragraphs correspond to sections ending at iv. 13, x. 18, xiii. 19.

"The New Covenant is better than the Old in two respects, its Mediator and its High Priest. Its Mediator is the very Son of God; greater than the angels who mediated the Old Covenant, in that He is the glorified heir (and so worthy of deeper obedience) and in that He has been exalted through death to be High Priest. He is greater than Moses the human mediator of the Old Covenant, even as a son is greater than a servant, however trusty; so He should not be grieved as Moses was, by

unbelief or fiickleness. Moses and Joshua failed to bring the people to the promised rest, but Jesus has entered into it and will lead into it all who persevere.

"The High Priest of the New Covenant is Jesus, the Son of God. This doctrine is indeed difficult, but it is a safeguard against apostacy and ruin, which can be averted if you have faith (like Abraham's) on Jesus our forerunner and High Priest. Consider Melchizedek; he was both priest and king, and his priestly rank was earlier and greater than that of Levi. Now Jesus is a priest of this kind, not like others by mere descent from Aaron, but on His own merits. This rank is confirmed by God's oath, eternal and unchangeable, for He Himself is holy, separate, and perfect. Consider Aaron the high priest; his office was typical, as was shown at its institution, and by the promise of a *new* covenant, and by the dull repetition of its ritual. Jesus is the intended High Priest; He cleanses from sin really, not by promise only. His death really ratified the true covenant, and opened the way to heaven. Devoting Himself to doing God's will, He became the only and eternal High Priest.

"The way being open to God, and such a sponsor being ready to introduce us, let us draw near in faith, not turning back nor throwing away the advantage won. Faith is no new specific, it was ever the mainstay of Israel's heroes. We should patiently follow Jesus, the leader and perfecter of faith, accepting trtials as the discipline appointed by our Father, not repining as Esau did, but encouraged by the thought of our covenant being better. Let us manifest the fruits of faith; let us hold to the faith of our teachers in Jesus Christ, the eternal Priest, even though it involve being driven out of the earthly Israel and worshiping by new sacrifices offered through Him alone. So may you strengthen your teachers, old and new."

This condensation of the argument reveals a few points at once. The tract was obviously addressed to people deeply attached to the Old Covenant, and extreme-

ly loth to abandon it. So fully does it enter into their frame of mind, that the whole of the first section has no other bearing. It may have incidental glimpses of wide truth, it may have passages of striking beauty and permanent value; but as a whole, the argument down to iv. 13 has done its work.

The great section, which after a digression, really begins at vii. 1 and ends at x. 18, is of very different value for our times. If Jesus is a priest of God's own appointment, who has once for all finished atonement, and permanently remains the unique priest; then not only Aaron, but all modern "priests" have nothing more to do in His line. And as sacerdotalism is so insistent to-day, this great passage is exactly the message needed.

The exhortations that follow are also of perennial application, and it is really astonishing how easily we can forget the exact circumstances of the original appeal, in finding the words instinct with life for ourselves.

PARAPHRASE OF i.-iv. 11.

After these preliminary glances, we may now narrow our field of view and attend to the first six chapters, paragraph by paragraph. The first is in such majestic rhythmic Greek that it deserves some special reproduction even in our less sonorous tongue:

"In numerous portions, in numerous manners, God formerly spoke to our sires through the prophets. To us at the last of these days in His Son, constituted of all things the heir, and through whom He created the ages. Who, being His glory's effulgence and print of His substance; upholding too all by the word of His power, achieved first a purification of sins, then seated Himself on God's right hand in heaven, becoming by so much the better than angels, as He is the heir of a Name more excelling.

"For to what angel did God ever say, 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee?' Was not this meant

for Jesus alone at his baptism? Or what angel ever received the promise, 'I will be his Father, and he shall be my son?' But looking forward to the Second Advent of Jesus, He says, 'And let all God's angels worship him.'

"Again, while about the angels He says, 'Who maketh His angels spirits, His ministers a flaming fire,' yet about the Son His language is as to an equal, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a right sceptre. 'Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness; therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.' Nor does this stand alone; 'Of old, O Lord, hast Thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure. Yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment, as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end.' Or, once again, to what angel did God ever say, as He did to Jesus, 'Sit Thou at my right hand, until I make Thine enemies thy footstool.' Angels are just laboring spirits, sent forth continually for service to God, on behalf of those about to inherit salvation.

"Wherefore we are bound to heed more earnestly what we heard, lest we be at all misled. For if the word spoken from Sinai through angels was established, so that every transgression or neglect received a just recompense; how shall we escape, if we are heedless of our great salvation. This was first announced to us by the Lord, was then confirmed to us by His apostles, and God added His witness by signs and miracles and various mighty works and endowments of the Holy Spirit according to His will.

"For not to angels did God subject the coming world, of which we were speaking. Remember the testimony, 'What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that Thou visitest him?' For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou hast put all things under his feet.' Note, in that phrase 'all things,' nothing

is excepted from his power. Now as a matter of fact, we do not yet see everything put under our feet; but we do see One, 'a little lower than the angels,' Jesus, 'crowned with glory and honor' to suffer death, that by God's grace He might taste death for every one. For it beseemed God, because of whom are all things, and through whom were all things, when He led many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through His sufferings. For both Jesus who hallows, and we who are being hallowed, are all of one Father; wherefore Jesus is not ashamed to call us Brethren, saying, 'I will declare Thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I praise Thee.' And again He ranks himself with us, 'I will put my trust in Him.' Or again, 'Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me.' Since then the children have shared flesh and blood, He too in like fashion partook of the same, that through his death he might neutralize him who held the power of death, the devil, and might free all who in fear of death passed all their life in slavery. For as we well know, it is not angels that He helps, but 'he helps the seed of Abraham.' So He ought in every way to become like His brethren, that He might become a merciful High Priest, and faithful, in all things relating to God, to make atonement for the sins of God's people. For having been tried by suffering, He can succor those who are still being tried.

"So then, holy brethren, partakers of a calling not to an earthly Canaan, but to a heavenly, consider Jesus as God's messenger, and as High Priest in our system. He is faithful to God who appointed him, as indeed 'Moses was in all God's house.' But our Jesus is worthy of more honor than Moses; Moses certainly was 'faithful in all God's house as a trusty servant,' calling attention to matters which should afterwards be explained; but Christ is the son, set over the house. What is the house? We are, if we persevere to the end, for against His church the gates of Hades shall not prevail. Prove that you be-

long to it, by holding fast, and remember the warning from the past:

"'To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your heart, as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness; when your fathers tempted me and saw my work. Forty years long was I grieved with that generation and said, They ever err in their heart, they have not known my ways. So I swore in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest.'

"So beware, brethren, lest in any of you too there be found an evil unbelieving heart, standing off from the living God. Exhort one another every day, while still the To-day echoes, lest any of you too be hardened by the deceit of sin. For indeed we have become partners with the Christ, provided our confident beginning is persevered in to the end. Reflect on that passage: 'To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation.' Who heard, yet provoked Him? All who came out of Egypt with Moses. With whom was He angry forty years? Those who sinned and left their bodies in the desert. Of whom did He swear that they should not enter into His rest? The disobedient. Now we see that it was their unbelief that kept them out; despite their glorious beginning; what may not unbelief do even for you, despite your glorious beginning?

"That promise of entering into His rest remained over for us; do not fall short of it. Good news is come to us as to them; it took no effect with them for lack of faith. Faith made us the heirs of that promise. The eternal rest mentioned at the creation; forfeited in the days of Moses was again offered in the days of David—clearly Joshua's entry into Canaan did not exhaust it--and was first earned by Jesus when He ended His atoning work. Shall not we also labor to the end, and then join Him therein?"

JESUS, THE SCRIPTURES, THE HEBREWS.

If now we pause to study this first section, the substance of the argument will not detain us long. Christian readers regard it as axiomatic that angels and Moses are not to be mentioned in the same breath with Jesus. Other readers doubt whether angels and Moses ever existed, and from utterly different motives would grant this result at once.

The description of Jesus however at the outset is remarkable, for its explicit ranking Him as only one shade less than the eternal God. The final revealer of God, the original creator of the universe, the destined ruler over it, partaker of God's glory, wielder of His power, Son and Heir. No such description had as yet been penned. And the greatness of the theme has produced a majesty of language hardly approached elsewhere in the whole Bible.

Then note the astonishing use made of the Old Covenant scriptures. The Law indeed is passed by, but from Psalms and Prophets are taken passages, regardless of their first application, which are regarded as bearing directly on Jesus. Nor is there any apology for this employment, it is assumed as current in the circles addressed. At Antioch in Pisidia, Paul had quoted the second psalm as really referring to the resurrection of Jesus; now this is seen to be a stock Christian argument. Solomon is taken as a mere shadow of Jesus, the true Son of David, as He had suggested to the Pharisees. Then the words of Jesus as to His coming on the clouds with great glory, sending forth his angels, recalls a passage from the old Greek Bible that seems to foretell it. So passage after passage is seen to have received already a Christian application, so that from the ancient scriptures new glories were flashing forth.

Yet while prophets and historians and psalmists were thus claimed as foretelling Christ, they are unhesitatingly subordinated to Him even in the very point of revealing

God. Their knowledge was piecemeal in effect, and gained in indirect ways; His was complete and direct. Clearly if ever it should be hard to reconcile an O. T. word with a word of Christ, the latter will decide and govern. Scripture is valuable as it relates closely to Christ. Such are obvious conclusions from the treatment of scripture here.

There is however no forgetfulness of the original meaning, even if it suits the writer often to leap on to the final. He can face facts frankly, comparing the ideal man of the eighth psalm with the real average man, and emphasizing the discrepancy; it is Jesus alone to whom are subjected the fish in the sea, and the waves thereof. He knows that the ninety-fifth psalm had a definite meaning for David's day; it was written to urge the men of that age to repentance, and he uses it in a similar fashion for his own age.

And this treatment of scripture, so unlike to the rabbinic style, he justifies by the profound remark that the word of God is living. Its power is not exhausted at first utterance; it may be only heard aright when Christ Jesus is taken as the true theme; its promises and warnings are not for the days of Moses and Isaiah and David alone, but for every generation. Nor is it feeble, easily dismissed; it has power to cleave to the heart of the most negligent and impenitent, and is so designed by Him whose glance pierces to the secrets of all, and whose word can stir the most careless.

This section also throws a little light on the writer and the readers. Of course he is a Jew; no one else would have the Jewish scriptures at his finger ends and treat them with such familiarity and reverence. And as plainly they are Jews too, for nobody else cared about angels and Moses and the devil. They live near enough to Christ to be witnesses of signs and wonders, and to experience the special gifts of the Spirit, yet far enough off to have heard of Him only through the apostles. They are in some great crisis, for the word To-day is hurled at them

again and again, as if to-morrow may be too late.

SECOND SUBJECT STATED, iv. 14—v. 10.

Having closed the first part of the argument, the author next announces his second proposition, that Jesus is the High Priest. The phrase has been employed once already, but not dwelt upon. It is part of the consummate art of this artist, that he springs no surprises, but drops hints and tones up the mind for his most startling doctrine. Even now he advances very cautiously, first enunciating his thesis at some length, then defining his terms, and sketching the two stages in his proof:

"As then we have a great High Priest who has entered the inmost heaven, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold firm our confession of Him. Our High Priest is not unable to appreciate our weaknesses, He has been tried in every way like us, except by sinning. So let us boldly come forward to the seat of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help in due season.

"Consider what a high priest is for. He is taken from among men; he is appointed to act for us in everything relating to God, especially to offer gifts and sacrifices for sin; he can compassionate the ignorant and erring because he himself is full of weakness; indeed this weakness obliges him not only to sacrifice for the people, but also for his own sins. And no one can assume this post of honor, he is called to it by God, as in the case of Aaron.

"Observe how Jesus fulfils these conditions. He did not thrust himself into the high-priesthood, but God glorified him when He said at the baptism, 'My Son art Thou, I this day have begotten Thee.' And more emphatically elsewhere, 'Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.' Jesus, in His life on earth made offerings, prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears, to God who could save him from death, and who did indeed heed his piety. Jesus, Son as He was, yet had to suffer, and therein learned obedience. And

having thus ripened, Jesus became for all that obey Him a source of eternal salvation. For God saluted Him as High Priest after the order of Melchizedek."

INTERLUDE: v. 11—vi. 20.

Here then the subject is plainly announced, but before proving it in detail, the author diverges from the main track in a masterly appeal not to rest content with repeating elementary truisms, but to brace themselves and discern new truth, that their growth in knowledge may keep pace with their growth in grace. This is skillfully brought round again to the very point of divergence, and the main theme is a second time led up to and announced:

"There will be much to say about Melchizedek, and it will be difficult to state it, as you have become dull in learning. For though after all this time you ought to be teaching, some one must actually teach you the very elements of Christian doctrine. You are like sucklings, not men; those who live on milk have no experience of sound doctrine, they are babes; but solid food is for mature men, who are practised in distinguishing good and evil teaching.

"So let us cease reiterating the simplest truths about Christ, and press on to fuller growth. Let us no longer lay the foundation, that work is dead before God and must be abandoned, that He demands faith in His promises, that Christian baptism is more than John's or than Jewish immersions, that the laying on of hands is in prayer for the gift of the Spirit, that our religion stands or falls with the reality of the resurrection, that there is eternal condemnation for sin. Let us build on this, if God will grant us aid. Build we must, yet how hard for those who have stopped. For when a man has once seen Christ and experienced the new life, and rejoiced in the gift of the Spirit, and realized how beautiful are God's promises and the might of the dawning age, if then he falls away, he cannot be renewed again to repent while he is cruci-

fying afresh the Son of God on his own account, and openly shaming Him. For the ground which has soaked in the frequent rain and yields food fit for those for whom it is tilled, receives again God's blessing; but if it produces thorns and thistles it is valueless and is near inheriting the curse of Adam; its end will be burning.

"Now this is not your case, dear friends; we have better hope of your salvation, though we do speak thus. God is fair, He remembers your record, the love you showed to Him by helping the brethren, as you still do. But we earnestly desire that each of you will persevere, not slackening, but following those who by endurance and trust inherited the promises. God's promise to Abraham is lasting; it was ratified by an oath; and this promise was obtained by perseverance. And as men give greater confidence by taking an oath, God met this custom and conveyed assurance that His promise should stand permanently, by taking an oath. Thus we have two unchangeable pledges of a truthful God to us who have taken refuge, encouraging us to grasp the hope set before us. And our hope anchors our soul, holding fast in the unseen world beyond the veil which Jesus has entered, both as our forerunner, and as our eternal High Priest after the order of Melchizedek."

CHARACTER OF THE HEBREWS.

This passage adds several strokes to the sketch of the readers. They were of long standing in Christian doctrine, so long that they ought to be an active, teaching, and missionary church. But unhappily they had rested content with works of practical benevolence, and had never striven to follow out the new doctrines to their natural issues. In their Christian thinking they revolved in a narrow circle. They had awakened to the best elements in the old prophetic teaching, as reiterated by John the Baptist, Jesus and James; they insisted on the uselessness of depending on their outward life for stand-

ing before God, and exercised a real trust in Him. They attached an undue importance to outward acts, such as baptism and laying on of hands, though certainly they dwelt upon the value of baptism as involving a pledge to Jesus, and of laying on of hands as indicating a recognition of the Spirit. They harped on the resurrection, as if it simply confuted the Sadducees, without seeing any deeper meaning; they were morbid about everlasting punishment, instead of preparing for everlasting life. These points are in the epistle by no means denied or disparaged, but are regarded as mere foundations on which a body of elaborate doctrine should already have been reared by a church of experience and thought.

And because these readers were so unenterprizing, burying their talent in a napkin instead of trading with it, they were in grave danger of forfeiting it. Their duty was to spread the knowledge of Jesus, commending Him in every way to fresh peoples hungering for the bread of life. If they received the dew of heaven on their souls, and used it for no better purpose than to produce a crop of quarrels or of dry teaching with no nourishment for others, what could they expect but to be burned off, that better seed might be sown in the cleared land? Nothing was lacking to them of advantages and impulses to spread the Gospel; early conversion and appropriation of the Spirit, experience of the benefits of its promises and the Spirit's gifts; yet nothing happened! And this passivity, this silence in face of a perishing nation, an ignorant world, was not regarded as having any authority on earth, that His commands to make disciples of all nations might be ignored. This open and flagrant neglect of His charge was dangerously akin to a public repudiation of Him, a jeering at His claims. Should this last step be taken, there was no chance of rescuing a man while he persisted in the conduct of Caiaphas. To this explicit denial of Jesus these readers had not come, despite ominous signs. They were facing in the right direction, but had come to a halt. And the best way to set

them again in motion was to supply fresh motive power; action depends on thought, and their thoughts were cramped. Their doctrines did not place Christ at the center, and could be expounded with hardly any mention of Him. It was needful to restore Him to the true place in their minds and hearts, then His bidding would inspire them afresh to obedience.

The new doctrine is founded on their favorite foundation. They insisted on faith in God. Now by exercising such faith, by patiently trusting in God's promise of a home, despite the long years of wandering in Mesopotamia and Egypt, despite the possession of Canaan by Hittites, Abraham obtained a new promise, of a great posterity. And lest his faith should waver at the long delay in fulfillment, God condescended to strengthen the promise by an oath. The promise descends to all Abraham's posterity, still unfulfilled in its deepest sense, and it may be claimed by all who exercise a like faith. But there is now a deeper sense evident. Is it the land which is in question? There is a heavenly Canaan into which Jesus has already entered as a forerunner of all the faithful. Is it the posterity which is in question? Jesus is the true son of Abraham, and those who join themselves to Him shall be as the sand on the shore or the stars in the sky. Into this Canaan he enters like Aaron into the Holy Place, and opens the way for all His brother priests to follow. These mighty and inspiring truths shall be unfolded in a way that shall appeal to every Jew captivated with the stately ritual of the temple.

In this interlude there are three obvious coincidences with I. Corinthians; the comparison with milk and solid food, the allusion to foundation, the reminiscence of planting, watering and increase. These may be due simply to the author's reading that letter, or to his depending also on his correspondents knowing it. This possibility deserves bearing in mind.

STAGNANT CHRISTIANS.

This passage is full of warning to us to-day. The church as a whole should be rebuked that after nineteen centuries its development of doctrine is so meager. Just a few points have been explored, and ever on them men are readier to repeat the formulas that satisfied the Greeks of the fifth century rather than think out afresh in the language of the twentieth. And strange to say, some have laid over again a very sandy foundation of teaching as to baptisms and laying on of hands, which is greatly in need of a storm to beat upon it.

Any local church will probably find many who should profit by studying this passage. How often we hear sturdy men of forty and aged Christians of seventy express their joy at "hearing the plain, simple gospel of salvation." Babies! They ought to be doing one of two things; either themselves going out into the country or slums or school to teach this simple gospel to others; or encouraging their pastor to lead them into deeper fields of study, and wider fields of action.

Protestants were very slow to learn that the duty of Christians is to spread the gospel everywhere. Lutherans never grasped this truth for two centuries, Baptists were a century later in learning it. And therefore Lutherans were cursed with rationalism, Baptists with Unitarianism or Antinomianism, a plentiful crop of thorns and thistles that had to be burned off before God could sow afresh. And where any group condemns itself to a blind conservatism on old lines, and cries with Moses that it will stand still and see the salvation of God, then it incurs the swift reproof of God. "Wherefore criest thou unto me? Go forward!" Against such dangers Baptists at least need only look at our past history; our victories have been won by our radicalism, by discarding tradition and going to the fountain head. And so there can surely be no lasting halt by those who began so well. The great fight of to-day, within Christian circles, is of evangelicals

against sacerdotalists. If we get a clear idea of the New Testament doctrine of Priesthood, there is less risk of being contaminated with a spurious doctrine. And in this study there are obvious advantages for those who vehemently disclaim all special priestly attributes for their ministers, alike in word, attire, and conduct, while they as strenuously insist on the atonement wrought by the Lord, and the right of every Christian—as a priest—to offer sacrifices of praise, prayer and beneficence. Such is the Baptist position.

IS MATTHEW 16:18 AN ANACHRONISM?

BY PROF. A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D.

In a recent lecture of Prof. James Drummond, D.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, he argued that Jesus could not have used the words attributed to him in Matt. 16:18, because the ecclesiastical conceptions were too advanced for his time. They were, he said, the addition of a scribe from a later period. This view is held by other scholars also. Leaving out of the question any reference to the divine nature or foreknowledge of Christ and looking at the matter purely from the historical point of view, one can justify the use of the ideas in this passage by the Master. The chief thought here is the perpetuity of the Messianic Kingdom. Now in 2 Sam. 7:8-16 the Kingdom is promised to David forever, through one of his sons, who will build a house for the Lord and whose throne will be set up forever. The Septuagint in 2 Sam. 7:13 reads: *Αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου, καὶ ἀνορθώσω τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἕως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.*

In Psalm 89 (88 in the Septuagint) the writer is lamenting the apparent failure of Jehovah to keep this promise. He recalls the covenant made with David (Ps. 89:3) in the words of Jehovah: "Thy seed will I establish forever, And build up thy throne to all generations." (Ps. 89:4). The Septuagint renders: *Ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἑτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου, καὶ οἰκοδομήσω εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν τὸν θρόνον σου .* He responds to the words of Jehovah: "And the heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Jehovah; Thy faithfulness also in the assembly of the holy ones." (Ps. 89:5). The Septuagint there reads: *Ἐξομολογήσονται οἱ οὐρανοὶ τὰ θαυμάσια σου, κύριε, καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν σου ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίων.*

The writer complains, however: "But thou hast cast off and rejected, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed."

(Ps. 89:38). The Septuagint has *τὸν χριστόν μου* for "thine anointed." He knows no man who "shall deliver his soul from the power of Sheol" (Ps. 89:48). The Septuagint has *ἐκ χειρὸς ᾅδου* for "power of Sheol."

Now it is not claimed that the writer of this Psalm had in mind the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah. Clearly he was wrestling with the problem of the promise of perpetuity made to the throne of David. But it is remarkable that all the distinctive terms used by Jesus in Matt. 16:18 occur in Psalm 89. The Psalm discusses the perpetuity of David's throne; Jesus discusses the perpetuity of the Messiah's Kingdom. Jesus felt himself to be the Son of David as the Messiah was acknowledged to be (Mark 11:10; Luke 19:40). There was no difference of opinion between Christ and the Pharisees as to whether the Messiah was to be the son of David (Matt. 22:41-46), but rather as to the character and personality of the Messiah. If it be admitted (for it is a commonplace in the Gospels) that Jesus proclaimed a spiritual kingdom, not a literal, visible kingdom of David (Luke 17:21, for instance), it is surely not straining a point to say that Jesus could see the Messianic application of the promise to David.

Let us then put Matt. 16:18 beside Psalm 89. Jesus said to Peter *Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς. δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν σὐρανῶν κτλ.*

Now in the Psalm (verse 4) we have the figure of building the throne with which compare building the house in 2 Sam. 7:13. Jesus does not use throne (*θρόνος*), but rather *ἐκκλησία* with *οἰκοδομήσω*. This is a slight mixture of images, but the very word *ἐκκλησία* appears in Ps. 89:5 though not in the precise sense as used by Jesus. In the image of Jesus *ἐκκλησία* is not in the etymological sense of assembly, but rather in the sense of *οἶκος*, house of God, people of God, as we have it in Heb. 3:6. *Οἶκος* in Numbers 12:7 was used for the people of God in which Moses was a servant. Peter himself (1 Peter 2:5) writing to the Christians of Asia Minor will call them a

spiritual house (*οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος*), a probable reminiscence of the words of Jesus to him.

Ἐκκλησία thus is a natural adaptation for the idea of the people of Christ, the Kingdom of Christ as he calls them in Matt. 16:19, the very next verse. It seems clear that Jesus makes no real distinction between *ἐκκλησία* in verse 18 and *βασιλεία* in verse 19. The two terms are practically one in the special sense given to each by Christ in this passage.

Peter had called Jesus by the momentous title Messiah, Christ, *χριστός*. This term is applied to David in this way Psalm 89 (verses 38 and 51). Moreover, Sheol, Hades, occurs in both places. In Ps. 89:48 we have *ἐκ χειρὸς ᾅδου*, while in Matt. 16:18 Jesus spoke of *πύλοι ᾅδου*. But the Gates of Hades is a common image in ancient Greek and occurs in the Septuagint text of Job 38:17 where we have *πύλαι θανάτου, πυλωροὶ ᾅδου*

In a word, the historical atmosphere of Matt. 16:18 is not that of a later ecclesiastical development. It finds its most natural and simple explanation in the spiritual interpretation of the idea of the Kingdom of David and many of the very words of Psalm 89, not in the way of literal quotation, but in the apprehension of the Psalm as a whole with the use of the most striking words and images condensed into two short verses.

Christ replies to Peter in the language of Psalm 89 which had been used about the perpetuity of David's throne. David's Greater Son interprets that language in the terms of the Messianic Kingdom or Church against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail. This is the sense in which God will keep His promise to David as to the perpetuity of his throne and about which the Psalmist was sore troubled. The historical interpretation of Matt. 16:18, therefore, demands that we look to Christ's knowledge of the Old Testament rather than to a later scribal interpolation as the true setting of the language of these verses. Thus understood the language is not anachronistic, but historically pertinent.

Louisville, Ky.

THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. RUFUS W. WEAVER, TH.D., BALTIMORE, MD.

The quest of the intellectual leaders of our times in every department of human knowledge is for synthesizing principles, for fundamental laws, for ultimate truths. The first clause in the credo of science reads: "I believe that the Universe is grounded in reason, and is, therefore, intelligible." Upon this basis scientists organize knowledge, form the curricula of the various schools, and seek through experiment and observation to discover the underlying principles and the universal laws of the world about us.

The most interesting of all the sciences is the most recent—the science that deals with the laws and the processes by which the human mind acquires knowledge. To this is given the name of Psychology. The study includes not only the observation of mental phenomena, the discovery of mental laws, the processes by which the mind acquires knowledge, but also the conditions that make knowledge possible. These conditions are the primary subjects of study for the student who desires to understand either Philosophy or Religion.

Every part of the Universe from the atom to the solar system is in ceaseless motion. The whole creation is subjected to transitoriness—the law of change. The outer world as ceaseless motion makes possible the inner world of thought, for consciousness is conditioned upon an ever changing environment. Feeling exists only in a world of inequalities. Freedom is possible only in the presence of moral peril. Shut in within the narrow limits that are horizoned by birth and death, bound down by laws that he did not make, and can never hope to change, living

upon a revolving sphere, half light and half shadow, with its endless procession of day and night, driven to toil by pangs of hunger, and eating only to hunger again. Man with his narrow, fretting mind, with his untaught will, restless within the limit of his perilous freedom, with his little heart-beat whose systole and diastole are measured by selfishness and love, stands among God's creatures the highest in divine favor only of what he may become. "For man was made to grow, not stop."

Motion is the originating condition of thought. Struggle is the originating condition of growth. Responsiveness to environment is the originating condition of life. Man, the crown of creation, was made to think, and thinking is possible only in the presence of ceaseless motion. Man was made to love, and love is possible only amid the recognized inequalities of personal life. Man was made to develope in moral power, and ethical action is possible only when the freedom extends to the privilege of doing something less than the best—to miss the mark—and to miss the mark is sin. If it be true, and of this there can be no doubt, that man was made for growth in thought, for growth in love, for growth in righteousness, then the conditions of life we so often deplore, struggle, suffering, sin are necessary to the upward progress of man toward personal moral perfection. This world may not be as Leibnitz claimed "the best possible world." It certainly is not as von Hartman claimed, the worst possible. But, this world for its purpose—for the development of man into the moral likeness of God—is the best possible world that Infinite Wisdom could plan and Infinite Power create. The true theodicy can be written only when the scope and purpose of God in the development of man is made its very foundation.

The second thesis in the credo of science is, "the Universe is so built around man that life for him is intelligent correspondence with his environment." Emerson somewhere says, "When God sought to secure certain ends in mankind, He wrought His purpose into the very

structure of the human mind." If Emerson be true, the structure of the human mind is a revelation of the will of God. The possibility of religion is to be found in God's likeness to man, as much as man's likeness to God. Indeed the most wonderful and certainly the most intimate revelation of God is that which is made to man through man himself. Wrought into the very structure of the mind of man as the sense of dependence, the appreciation of perfection and the loneliness of soul that is unsatisfied until the soul rests in God. Man is inevitably religious.

The Psalmist cries "What is man that Thou are mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visiteth him?" What are those wonderful powers that enable man to extend hospitality to God and elevate him to the degree that he is continually in the thought of God? His sphere of knowledge is limited to consciousness and extension. His powers of creation are limited to the present moment, and are measured by the span of life which begins in helplessness and ends in helplessness. His appreciations are limited to the comparisons, sensations that come to him through some one of the gateways of the mind, or the comparisons of ideas for which he has learned some symbols to imagine and describe. And the Maker of Heaven and earth seeks to enter into relations with man! Why? Because man has the potency of becoming a son of God just as the unhatched bird has the potency of flight.

Religion is a relation, limited in its expressions to man's apperceptions. The superhuman relations of humanity are everywhere apperceived in a three-fold way: The first is the cosmological application of the law of cause and effect, seeking a cause or causes behind the things that appear. Polytheism is the product of unenlightened minds creating gods and goddesses to account for the forces of nature. The second universal apperception grows out of the sense of dependence, and the devotees of every religion attribute to their God or gods authority over their lives. Out of this experience,

emerges the consciousness of moral order, the law written in the heart of every man. The third apperception is the personification of the object of worship. Humanity attributes personality to stone and graven images as well as to Him who is spiritual and demands a worship that is spiritual. Out of this apperception arise all the forms of worship, gifts, sacrifices and the infinite variety of religious services from the dances of the Pueblo Indians to the simple worship of the Quaker Meeting-house. This feeling after God is the impressive evidence that man is incurably religious.

There are religions, false and true. False religions are perpetuated by the same method as true religions. Error gathers her worshipers in the same way that Truth gathers her worshipers and often Error crushes Truth to earth. The God who sends the rain upon the just and the unjust alike has so constructed the human mind that it receives ideas that belong to the realm of religion alike whether they be true or false. Every religion reduced to its simplest form is a group of ideas perpetuated from one individual to another individual. Religion, therefore, in its simplest form is communicated idea. The religious experiences of individuals are determined by the ideas of religion communicated to him. The readjustment the individual makes to these ideas determines the expressions of his religious life. Religion is a phase of psychology. The truthfulness of a religion is established by three successive modes of proof. First, that the revelation, the group of communicated ideas, is true. Second, that the mind is empowered to apperceive this revelation. this group of communicated ideas, is true. Third, that the mind is strengthened to express this apperception of truth in worship, conduct and character.

The Christian Religion presents a revelation to man of the *Power that produced him, the Authority that is over him and the Unseen Being with whom he is capable of communing, as tthe God and Father of our Lord Jesus

*See W. N. Clark's Outlines of Christian Teeology.

Christ, and extends to him the invitation to enter into relationship with God, so that he may say, "Abba, Father." Christianity in its simplest form is a communicated idea, called the Gospel, and the supreme mission of Christianity is the spreading of the idea, declaring it unto all the nations.

How does Christianity meet the three-fold test of religion? (1) the truthfulness of the revelation; (2) the certainty of its being accurately apperceived; (3) the bestowal of the power for its accurate expression? First, what proof does Christianity offer that this revelation is true? The revelation which Christianity offers is Jesus Christ. The highest forms of truth can only be expressed in personality. Language fails. Jesus Christ stands before the world as the most perfect moral example, the supreme teacher in ethics, claiming to be "the only begotten of the Father," and seeking to bring humanity into filial relation with God. The strongest evidence of the truthfulness of his revelation appears in His resurrection—God Himself in this bearing witness that the revelation made by Jesus Christ is true. The personal experience of him who receives the Gospel is confirmatory evidence of its truthfulness—God, in this experience bearing witness to the truthfulness of the Gospel through the witness of the Holy Spirit. The truthfulness of the revelation if further established by its meeting all the needs of the soul, bestowing not only the forgiveness of sins, but releasing the soul from the dominion of sin, but also awakening in the consciousness a realization of the new relations, new incentives, new capacities, creating a new test in that the Gospel idea is so simple, so human, so spiritual environment. Christianity meets the second divine that wherever received by personalities differing ever so widely, it produces essentially the same effects. The Christian consciousness of primitive Christians is identical with the Christian consciousness of the modern Christian. The higher righteousness that characterizes the life of a Christian after his conversion is the living

truth that new strength is given to express his new relation to God, showing that new spiritual energy has been imparted—and thus the third test is met.

Christianity is the true religion because its Founder is incarnate Truth, because its message exactly fits man's capacity to understand, and meets man's unsatisfied needs, because through it a divine reinforcement enters into his life, enabling him to triumph in the struggle with his lower nature, and to live in the consciousness of a new and permanent relationship with God.

The essence of Christianity is communicated idea. The Gospel which we preach in its simplest form is an idea in process of communication. There are two conceptions of Christianity in Christendom. The one is communicated actuality and the other is communicated idea. The one emphasizes the sensuous appeal and the other emphasizes the thoughtful appeal. The first is based upon the fallacious belief that spiritual reality may be actually transformed into material reality. The fundamental fallacy of the Roman Church is not to be found in its doctrine of the Church, but in its dogma of the bodily presence of Christ in the host and the actual presence of his blood in the wine. If the Roman priest actually reproduces the sacrifice of Christ, then all the claims of the Church can be easily verified. If he can prove that Christianity in its simplest form is not an idea communicated from person to person he is in a position to overthrow the Protestant religion; for the Protestant position, philosophical, psychological and theological has for its foundation the following thesis: "The Universe is so organized that it is possible for man to think, to grow, to choose, and to enter voluntarily into relations with his God—that the prayer of man, groping after God, is answered in God's revelation, whose final word is an invitation to man to enter into filial relation with God as his Father, and everyone who enters into this relation is commanded to communicate the invitation to others."

Jesus brought the Good News. He proclaimed it with

His lips in healing words. He proclaimed it with His hands in loving ministeries. He proclaimed it with His life in unwearied love. He proclaimed it through His death in behalf of humanity. And, when He was raised from the dead, He committed His mission to His disciples, saying, "As the Father hath sent Me, even so, send I you." In the teachings of Jesus there is no intimation of a dependence upon the New Testament or any other book for the perpetuation of His Gospel. There is not even the suggestion that the New Testament was destined to come into existence. It is dangerous to argue from silence, yet, it is a reasonable presumption that if Jesus had considered the New Testament necessary for the establishing of His Kingdom He would have bidden His disciples to write as well as preach. If He had considered a literature an adequate expression of the revelation He had come to make, would not Jesus Himself have written a book? Can the highest forms of Truth be expressed in the symbols of language and literature? Can the necessity of the incarnation be established upon any other claim save that of the inadequacy of human speech and human literature to manifest the truths of deity? Jesus trusted His revelation to be reincarnated in His followers rather than embodied in a literature, for there were elements in that revelation that can never be put into words, elements that can be experienced but never fully described. Jesus choose that the group of ideas composing His revelation should be communicated only by men who had experienced the transforming power that followed the acceptance of these ideas. The fundamental principle of Christianity is "experience precedes expression."

Jesus upon Mount Olivet gave to His disciples the Good Tidings, commissioning them to tell His message, His Gospel, to all the nations of the earth. Without that message the nations should grope on in darkness, searching after God, lifting lame hands of faith toward specters of the divine reality, but not finding Him—their Father

--God. Jesus had prepared His followers fully for the perpetuation of His work, the enlightening and redeeming of the world. In His great commission He bids His disciples to go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He commanded, and closing with the words "and lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the age." Jesus had fully equipped His disciples for the divine task. He had given to them the message. He had promised them the enduement with power from above. He bade them go.

The group of awed disciples returned with a strange sense of loneliness to the upper room. There had been left to them the mission of communicating the message of Jesus to the world, and that message existed in their thoughts and experiences. Did it exist in any other form? Thirty years were destined to pass before any part of the words of Jesus would be enshrined in literature. Did Jesus leave the world with His message deposited in the minds of frail, tempted men, and with no assurance that it would be accurately proclaimed, except the promised leading of the Holy Spirit? Let us study anew the Great Commission. In it there is a three-fold movement. First, the discipling of the nations; Second, baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; Third, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded. In the study of the three-fold mission there is but one fixed, ordained requirement—the act of baptism. There was then, and there ever has been variety in the way that men have been brought to be disciples. There was then, and there ever has been variety in the way that the teachings of Jesus have been given to men. It breaks upon us with startling force that Jesus risked this enterprise in magnitude most extensive, in its importance of priceless value, in its momentous nature, a matter of life and death, involving the destiny of mankind, and risked it in the hands of a company of ordinary men, of little scholar-

ship, of manifold prejudices, slow of heart to believe and slower still in recognizing the significance of their world-wide mission. There is but one explanation: Jesus conceived His message to be sufficiently guarded and preserved in the symbol of baptism.

The place of baptism in the teachings of Jesus is an offense to millions who declare that they honor His name. They turn from it, saying that it is only a form, and it does not matter whether it be performed in the way that He commanded or not. This declaration is one of the most subtle assaults upon the sanity of Jesus ever made by those who claim to honor His intellectuality. Did He introduce this command as one of the three that should embody the mission of all Christians for all succeeding time, giving to it a place so that it should appropriately stand between the two great experiences of the spiritual life—the one of regeneration, becoming disciples, and the other of sanctification, growth in grace and the knowledge of Christ? What explanation of baptism can be made that will give to it the right to its lofty position? For this explanation we seek the oldest of the Christian writings, the New Testament. In it, we are told, baptism embodies three ideas; (1) the idea of the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ—historical Christianity; (2) the idea of regeneration, buried with Him by baptism unto death, raised to walk in newness of life, the spiritual experience of the individual—living Christianity; (3) the idea of the resurrection of the body through the spirit that raised Jesus from the dead, quickening the mortal body—prophetic Christianity. These three tenses of Christianity, the past, present and future, were deposited in baptism. Various writers of the New Testament recognize their presence in their discussions of baptism. The ordinance of baptism became for the early Christians the visible expression of the message of Christianity. All that is essential in the revelation of Christ is here epitomized. The Gospel was destined to be communicated in other languages than those in which Jesus

and His disciples spoke. There was a necessity that it be preserved in a fixed, unchanged form that should epitomize all the essential elements of Christianity, there is no one that so readily, so beautifully, so completely expresses the essential ideas in Christianity as the act of baptism. It is not too much to say that baptism is the Bible which Jesus prepared and that every immersion and emersion in the name of the Triune God is a newly printed copy of the Book. Jesus intended that Christianity should be communicated through personalities that had experienced the transforming power of His message and their confessions be made in this form which He ordained. There is in baptism a sufficient revelation for the perpetuation of Christianity if every Bible were destroyed and every Church leveled to the ground, provided that the revelation were made by two persons, the one administering it, having had its required experience and the other submitting to it, proclaiming anew that experience. The union in Christianity which we all seek for can be realized when Christianity returns to Jesus and submits, as He submitted for the fulfillment of righteousness to the confession of baptism. Then Christians recognizing the essence of Christianity, will agree upon the expression of tthat agreement in this visible form, more beautiful than any figures of speech, more accurate than any statement of the lips, more complete than the articles of any creed.

Among the modern groups of Christianity who practice the mode of baptism commanded by Jesus are two, who in point of intelligence and numbers are conspicuous; the Disciples and the Baptists. These two bodies are each year growing closer and closer together. To-day we are placing the emphasis upon the points of agreement rather than the points of disagreement, and we rejoice that the points of disagreement are lessening in number. Baptists began their historical career by emphasizing the new birth as a prerequisite to church membership. Later the emphasis fell upon the form of baptism. The strong-

est contention so far has been for the restoration of immersion as the only form of Christian baptism. The basis of this contention has been obedience to Christ—loyalty to Christ. Baptists hold that salvation is secured by faith in Jesus Christ and that this faith manifests itself in obedience to Christ in which baptism is an incident, not necessary to salvation, but necessary to church fellowship, and they have refused to recognize churches that fail tto practice immersion as properly organized churches. The weakness of the Baptist position has been the failure to emphasize the meaning, and therefore the ethical value of baptism. We have defended it successfully as a form, but our claim that it is not necessary to salvation has greatly weakened our appeal to the Pedobaptist world. The position of the intelligent Pedobaptist is, "you have proved immersion, but what of it? You admit that it is merely a form, and one form is as good as another if it be used as a confession of faith in Christ." The Disciples have maintained that the form of baptism is immersion, and that it is intimately associated with the forgiveness of sins. This is based upon the Scripture regarding "baptism for the remission of sins." This has led many Disciple leaders to insist that baptism is necessary to salvation, there being no remission of sins without baptism. Others hold the position that no confession of Christ is complete without baptism and that the promise that Christ makes, "Whosoever will confess Me before men, him also will I confess My Father who is it Heaven?" is one which gives assurance only to the baptized. It appears to me that Baptists and Disciples are both right in their beliefs; the one that baptism by immersion is necessary to obedience and the other that baptism by immersion is closely associated with the forgiveness of sins. But beyond the command of Christ, Baptists have failed to present convincing argument for the form, and Disciples have failed to establish that the forgiveness of sins is inseparably connected with baptism. If it be accepted as true that Chris-

tianity in its simplest form is a group of ideas that gather about death and resurrection and that Christian baptism is the visible expression of these ideas, the argument for baptism among Baptists is transferred from th ecommand to the *raison d 'être* of the command, and the necessity for its observation as a Christian revelation becomes equally urgent, if not more urgent than the necessity for the preservation of the New Testament. If baptism be the Gospel idea enshrined in a form that rises triumphant over the division of races, the separation of languages and the changes of time, it possesses a value as a vehicle for the communication of the Gospel, surpassing all the symbols of speech and literature. If this conception of baptism be accepted by Disciples, they will have ample argument to prove that the act of baptism is intimately associated with the forgiveness of sins. Baptism becomes the perfect confession of Christ, and as the visible form of the Gospel is intimately associated with the forgiveness of sins.

Baptists hold that regeneration is mediated by the Holy Spirit. Disciples hold that regeneration is mediated by the Word. The tendency of the one has been to emphasize the emotional experience; the tendency of the other has been to emphasize the intellectual experience. If the emphasis be properly distributed, we would find that the intellectual experience, the apperception of the Gospel, comes first. The emotional experience, the response to the Gospel, comes second, while the profession before the world in the ordinance of baptism, is third. The Holy Spirit is acting throughout each of the three movements. Thus, the Pauline phrase "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" is the accurate, scientific account of the genesis of the Christian life; the Lord is the incarnation of the Gospel; the faith is the response of the soul to the Gospel, and the baptism is the profession of the power and the verity of Gospel. Baptism may appropriately be called the Creed of Christ; for baptism is the visible of the essence of the Christian message. Baptism is God's final

revelation to men enshrined in beautiful symbolism.

An address delivered by President E. Y. Mullins, D.D., before the Baptist World Congress entitled, "The Trend of Modern Theology" has created widespread interest. He concluded the address with six axioms for which Baptists stand. Axioms are self-evident statements made in view of and because some mathematical proposition or theorem has been indubitably proved. These axioms of President Mullins demand some such basis; and in his masterly discussion he fails to furnish definitely that Christian theorem. This theorem I find in baptism; and presenting as the primary axiom, the psychological axiom: "A certain likeness of God to man makes possible a divine revelation to man," I subscribe heartily to the six axioms that follow: The Theological axiom; "The holy and loving God has the right to be sovereign;" The religious axiom: "All men have an equal right to direct access to God;" The ecclesiastical aniom: "All believers have equal privileges in the Church;" The moral axiom: "To be responsible man must be free;" The social axiom: "Love your neighbor as yourself;" The religio-civic axiom: "A free Church in a free State." These seven self-evident principles inhere in baptism as the seven colors inhere in white light, and the light is the light of the Gospel of the Son of God, the Message of Christianity.

So far I have said nothing regarding the Lord's Supper. As baptism epitomizes the Christian message, so the Lord's Supper epitomizes the Christian experience. The Gospel is visibly portrayed in baptism and the effects of the Gospel are visibly portrayed in the Lord's Supper. They sustain to each other the relation of cause and effect. In baptism is symbolized the genesis of the Christian life. In the Lord's Supper is symbolized the growth of the Christian life. Christian Theology is the biology of the eternal life. The clearest and simplest statement of the biology of the eternal life is given in these symbols, which we are accustomed to call, the or-

dinances. As in baptism we have the three tenses of the Christian message, so in the Lord's Supper we have the three tenses of the Christian experience. The death of our Lord, symbolized in the broken bread and poured out wine, is the historical fact that makes possible the Christian experience of regeneration. The partaking of the bread that nourisheth and the wine that strengtheneth portrays the present spiritual experience of the soul, nourished and strengthened through Christ. The anticipations of the Lord's Supper refers to His second coming, for which we are ever expectant, and to the feast in the Kingdom of God, when our Lord will sit down with those whom He has redeemed. The Lord's Supper epitomizes for us the Christian experience. Baptism and the Lord's Supper contain the essential ideas of Christianity. Together they form the primary revelation and possess for us a unique value, because they represent to us in the forms which Christ Himself chose to be the permanent expression of His revelation. Baptism and the Lord's Supper together present to us the Essence of Christianity in visible symbols. The New Testament is but the enlargement of these ideas in baptism and in the Lord's Supper, giving fuller definitions, clearer applications, and increasing illustrations of the meaning of these ideas as holy men of God acting under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit were led to write.

Jesus founded His Church upon the rock-principle—"experience precedes expression." The confession of Peter was the outward expression of an inward experience. Upon this rock-foundation, Christ and His disciples builded the impregnable fortress of the Church. Two massive towers were planned and reared by the Master Himself; the one standing at the entrance and the other within. The one tower is named Christian baptism and the other tower is named the Lord's Supper. The walls of the Church were reared by the Apostles and Prophets. They are the New Testament Scriptures. Thus, rose the Church of Christ against which the gates of

death cannot prevail. If the walls ever should be thrown down, and sooner we may expect the stars to be flung from their orbits and chaos to reign, there would remain the impregnable and time-conquering towers, reared by the divine Logos, the eternal Christ; and these towers guard and preserve the Christian message and the Christian experience; and these towers are for us and for the ages to come the visible expression of the Essence of Christianity.

SOME PHASES OF THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE LITERATURE OF THE ANCIENT ORIENT.

BY PROF. IRA M. PRICE, PH. D., LL. D.,

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Literature is crystallized human life. "Language is the coin-current of thought" (Robertson, *Early Relig. of Israel*). Its preservation in written form represents the truly permanent and valuable remains of civilization, in every period of the world's history. Indeed, the literary remains of any age are a true revealer of the character of that age. Through these we see not only the mental, but the physical, moral, and spiritual life of any given period or people. I would not affirm that literature is the only revealer of such character, but as we look back into the past it is the chief and most reliable one.

Accessory to it, are the remains of architecture, sculpture, painting, religion and commerce. Each of these elements of civilization possesses its increment of value, and helps us to fill out the picture of the people or the nation whom we may be endeavoring to present. But of all the nations great and small, of the past and present, with all their magnificent achievements in political power, and literary fame, there is none which possesses the same charm for the Christian student and scholar as the ancient Hebrews. They were and are 'the people of the Book,' as the Rabbis are fond of saying. To them we are indebted for the reception, preservation, and promulgation of the doctrine of one God. They were the lineal antecedents of the writers and speakers of the New Testament. Their religion was the basis, and contained the germ, of much that grew up, blossomed, and came to full fruition in the life and teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But the task that lies before me in this lecture necessarily has its limitations, and even within these, I can give merely a bird's eye view, of some of the facts and problems that face every thoughtful reader and student of the literature of the Old Testament. It is not within my range to discuss either the revelation or the inspiration of this literature, and this fact must be kept constantly in mind, but rather to look at it in this lecture from the point of view of literature as such.

The Old Testament is the most valuable literary storehouse of antiquity. In the variety of literary form employed, in the range of themes discussed, and in the maintenance of a high moral and spiritual tone, it towers above every literary product of all the centuries preceding the Christian era. Such literary excellence and preeminence have given it first consideration in every discussion that pertains to the Semitic race, and the history of religion.

Before we attempt to pass judgment on the literary form and style of the Old Testament, we must fully realize that it was the literary product of an Oriental people, and was permeated through and through with distinctively Semitic thought that was cast in a Semitic mould. In the very nature of the case, an Occidental cannot understand or interpret a Semitic Oriental, even today, as some of us have learned by severe experience, until he has made his mysterious stranger a subject of comprehensive and thorough study. Much less should any one of us presume to be able to understand, to interpret, and to dogmatize on the writings of a people of ancient days, when we have slight familiarity with their history, language, and customs. No one can appreciate more keenly the full import of this statement than the translators of the Old Testament. They must transfer, or carry over into English, a language of almost unbounded range of vocabulary—the thought of the Hebrew, which has only about 6,000 words in its vocabulary, and is replete with Oriental pictures, idioms, and customs.

What wonder, then, that some parts of the Old Testament are obscure, that many of its customs, hints, and references, are still mysterious! The simple marvel is, that we who read, not simply the English, but the Hebrew, can get near enough to it to feel the warmth of the life-blood that makes it glow with beauty and power.

I.

Let us now turn our attention to a brief inquiry as to the origin of this remarkable collection of Semitic books. Whence did they arise? By whom, and for what purpose, were they written? What is their content?

The answers to these questions within the last century have filled our library shelves. They have been written by every school of biblical thought, and have reached all the way from the adamantine position of the dogmatist, to the wildest speculations of the extreme radical. In other words, the answers are graded from the method of the man who first lays down a dogma and decides absolutely, in his own mind, "what was," to the arrant critic whose cherished hypothesis determines what "must have been." Or still more definitely the answers are as wide apart as these statements: (1) the writers of the books of the Old Testament received all that they said and wrote it down as a direct, verbal revelation from God, and (2) the literature of the Old Testament as such arose comparatively late in the history of Israel, not dating back of the song of Deborah, in fact, that poem is cited as the earliest specimen of Hebrew literature.

Neither the dogmatist nor the radical has the correct point of view. And the discoveries of the last century have compelled every writer to modify his answer. On what grounds? When we survey the arguments and conclusions of the writers who have decided for themselves the origin of the literature of the Old Testament we find that, up to within a quarter century, they have discussed Israel as practically an isolated race or people, with no

literary antecedents or contemporaries. From this viewpoint they have naturally determined the origin, growth, and final literary form of the Old Testament books.

But the last three-quarters of a century have seen stupendous revelations in the Orient. God has led man to the treasures hidden away and preserved for these days of minute scholarship and speculation, of investigation and research. The temples, tombs and tablets of Egypt and Babylonia have spoken. Vast libraries of ancient literature, on cylinders, seals, statues and papyri, now enrich the great museums of the world. The disintegrating ruins of the Mesopotamian valley, the dismantled fortresses and fastnesses of Elam and Persia, have contributed their part to the immense body of Oriental literature that now claims a place on the shelves of our libraries.

The fascinating and romantic stories of the decipherment and interpretation of these once mysterious remains of ancient civilizations must be passed over in regretful silence. The significance of these interpretations, however, is of untold value to us. What do they reveal? In the first place, they affirm in unequivocal terms, that the ancient Oriental world of South Western Asia and Egypt was occupied almost as long before Abraham's day, as we live since his day, by great nations and mighty empires who were in possession of a culture that every year, and after every inscription newly deciphered, shines forth with new lustre. In the second place, we discover that these old people were not illiterates, nor mere wandering nomads, but that they employed languages now known to us, that reveal in a wonderfully graphic manner their actions, thoughts and aspirations—and these, many centuries before Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees. Now, as we come down the centuries to Abraham's day and beyond, we discover a literary talent—particularly in Babylonia as seen in the code of Hammurabi, and other contemporary matter—that smites us with amazement. And this at 2250 B. C. in Babylonia, the place from which

and about the time when Abraham migrated westward! If now, we take a stride forward of about 1,000 years, we reach the time of Moses. Certainly there was no literary deterioration either in Babylonia or Egypt during this period. The phase of the question that is of prime interest to us is, that these great nations millennia before the time of Moses produced documents, that we may justly call in a broad sense, literature. These compass a large range of subjects, and are in character, historical, religious, magical, astrological, genealogical, philological and commercial. And they were written, too, in languages that were read and understood, at least, by the ruling and educated classes of the people. As we leave the time of Moses (locating the exodus of Israel from Egypt at 1276 B. C., and later) and come on down to the time of the fall of Samaria (722 B. C.) or the fall of Jerusalem (586) or the fall of Babylon (538), we pass through periods in which masses of literature were produced in the great nations of which we today, have many thousands of volumes in the form of clay tablets, bricks and seals. We know also that the small people on the east coast of the Mediterranean Sea were not ignorant of writing even in the fifteenth century B. C., as the Tel el-Amarna tablets, discovered in Egypt in 1887-8, tell us, as well as do hints here and there in the Old Testament. Professor Sayce long ago pointed out that the name of one ancient city of Palestine, Kirjath-Sepher, means "book-city."

I think I have said enough to indicate that Israel was simply one little one among the great nations of antiquity, and that her leaders were doubtless acquainted with the civilization of those days. It is not at all improbable that they were acquainted with methods of writing such documents as were prepared by those great nations. This acquaintance, too, must have extended to methods of preservation as well as to material used, and so vitally affected the good sense that preserved such records as we find in the Old Testament.

Thus the great civilization from which Abraham migrated, the people and lands through which he traveled, and the land of Egypt in which his descendants sojourned, wrote down and preserved their records, both to emphasize their own importance, and to encourage and inspire posterity. It would have been physically possible so far as environment was concerned, for the patriarchs and their immediate descendants to have put into writing the records of their times. Certainly, the education and training of Moses, in view of all the literary activity of the great nations of his day, are favorable to the view that he had a part in the production of the Hebrew literature that comes down from his day. In fact, it is most probable that each period of Israel's history produced its own records, and that these were put into form by compilers, revisers and editors at some later date. Now in all this I am not saying that these documents were merely the records of men's words and deeds. In many places, the writers say, "Thus said the Lord," an explicit statement that what follows was conveyed to the speaker or writer in some way by the Spirit of the Lord.

In view of the statements already made regarding the peoples contemporary with Israel, it is clearly evident that Israel herself, through her leaders, could and would have produced records of her political, social and religious life. In fact, enough evidence is found in the Old Testament to show that there were regularly constituted officials, whose business it was to record the events of their times; also that the prophets even from David's day were now and then the historians of the successive periods of history.

II.

This brings me to the second point in the discussion, namely the form of this literature. What is the form that we find as we examine it?

On turning to the Old Testament the thoughtful and careful reader very soon discovers that almost no book

of it reads straight ahead like a modern production. This discovery may be due to one or both of two things. In the first place, let us suppose that the reader is not an Oriental, and that he looks at things through Occidental eyes. This may seem to be of slight consequence, but one illustration may serve to make my meaning plain. The Oriental usually states a result, and then goes back to recite its cause, e. g., Gen. 10 gives the distribution of the people on the earth, and chapter 11 the reason for that distribution. In the second place, he finds that the narrative is abruptly broken here and there, and that the events in the historical books and the chapters in the prophetic books are not always arranged in chronological order. It is also discovered at the same time, that the narrative passes over long years of activity with but few verses. E. g., the reign of Jeroboam II. of Israel, extending over forty-one years is disposed of in seven verses; and the reign of Manasseh of Judah, covering fifty-five years is dispatched with eighteen verses. More than this, he finds at the conclusion of Jeroboam's reign this statement (2 Kings 14:28). "Now, the rest of the acts of Jeroboam, and all that he did, and his might, how he warred, and how he recovered Damascus, and Hamath, *which had belonged* to Judah, for Israel, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel?" And at the close of the record of Manasseh's reign (2 Kings 21:17), this reference is made: "Now the rest of the acts of Manasseh, and all that he did, and his sin that he sinned, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?" In other words, the reader of these records in the Book of Kings is referred for any further information regarding these monarchs to the annals that were officially kept by the king's recorder. This fact very naturally leads to the question as to the method by which this book or these books were prepared.

The Books of Kings and Chronicles contain scores of references to annals, records, biographies and other writ-

ings which were the sources of information used by their compilers. It is evident that the editor or editors selected from these numerous and various original documents only such matter as served their very definite purpose. These books then are compilations of a selection of matter gathered from a wide range of original sources. They were most probably put into their present form not much later than the time of the latest event mentioned therein.

On examination of this literary compilation, it does not take long to find one of the principles of selection. Only such matter is woven into the narrative, as serves to teach a moral or religious lesson. In the reigns of the kings, many things that a modern historian would regard as essential to the perfection of his account, are not even hinted at. E. g., what was the exact order of events that resulted in the dissolution of Solomon's kingdom? How was it possible that Jeroboam II. was able to carry his conquests so far northward and win back territory that had once been conquered by David and lost by Solomon? And some things that we should have put into a foot-note or left out altogether—such as the long dry-as-dust genealogical tables—are sacredly retained and given an important place in the whole record. The compiler was not a historian, nor did he arrange his selected material primarily to teach history. Hence, while we have not a continuous or connected narrative, the matter in general is arranged in chronological order.

The form of the Books of Samuel is likewise that of Kings and Chronicles. It is clearly evident that the matter was compiled, as any one can readily see, by the putting together of pieces of information, here and there, that break any continuous thread of the narrative. As for example, the two accounts of David's presentation to Saul, and the supplemental chapters 21-24, of 2 Samuel, that gather up individual and scattered documents touching the life of David. Joshua and Judges, likewise, present the same kinds of evidence that they were put together by some sacred editor or editors, who carefully

collected out of the contemporary records such specific events, persons and words, as would enforce some specific phases of truth.

And the book of Genesis, on any estimate, contains material, all of which was compiled by an editor. And its present form is the result of the putting together of these pieces of ancient records to serve the high and noble purpose of the editor.

Coming down to post-exilic times, we find that Ezra and Nehemiah were constructed on a principle similar to Kings and Chronicles, and are as fragmentary and unsatisfactory, as secular history as any book we have in the canon.

Now what can be said of the prophetic books? In many cases we know that the prophets both spoke and wrote down their prophecies. Indeed, it is rightly thought that this was the then regular method of procedure. But when we take the books that are attributed to them—and I speak mainly of the great prophets—we discover that the arrangement of the discourses and of the chapters is not chronological, or even doctrinal. Neither were they placed in the order of utterance. There are, however, little groups of prophecies set here and there; e. g., those against foreign nations in Isaiah are found in chapters 13 to 23, in Jeremiah, chapters 46-51, and in Ezekiel, chapters 25-32. And even within these groups they are not arranged in chronological order, but on same principle, not self-evident, nor yet agreed on by students and scholars. Outside of, and beyond, this group in each great prophet, the chapters have probably been placed in their final order which is chronological—for the purpose of enforcing some great truth. Of all the prophets, Jeremiah was most free to quote, and comment on, the words and prophecies of his predecessors. Isaiah quotes about two chapters (15 and 16) of an earlier prophecy against Moab, and Ezekiel combines in chapters 27-32 a vast amount of valuable information, gathered from wide sources, on Tyre and Egypt. The most that internal evidence reveals in the minor prophets is that they consist

of short discourses pieced together, sometimes with a consecution of thought, but oftener without any such connections.

When we turn to the poetical books we have a variety of form before us. The Book of Psalms is one of the most interesting books of the Bible, merely from a literary point of view. Its 150 psalms are documents that stretch through the larger part of Israel's history, from David's time down into the post-exilic period. These charming little poems were, at some time, collected into five books, each closing with a doxology. These books, however, do not present the poems either in chronological or doctrinal order. For, psalms attributed to David are found in the last as well as in the first book. It is probably true that there is a general chronological order, for there are more late psalms in Book V., than in either of the previous books. It is evident that the compilers of this great collection gathered up and inserted here and there groups that cluster about one name or one theme. We find groups in the psalms of Asaph (73-83), the psalms of the Sons of Korah (42-49), the Hallel psalms (111-118), the psalms of the Ascents (120-134). These may have constituted small collections that were in use in the temple services and in the final compilation of their great hymn book, the Psalter, they were given a permanent place. Both these small collections of poems, and the great compilation itself were revised from age to age as the demands of the temple-service and the modifications of the language required. The changes introduced were just about what is done to some of our old and beloved hymns, by modern editors of music books. They removed obsolete words, and inserted new words for those whose meanings had been modified by the march of time and custom. These statements find their proof in a careful and minute comparison of Psalm 18, and 2 Sam. 22, which are one and the same poem; and also in Psalm 53 which is another edition of Psalm 14. Wherever the word Jehovah occurs in Psalm 14 it has

been changed to Elohim "God," in Psalm 53. In fact, there seem to have been times in which one name for God rather than the other, was held in chief esteem. When we examine the Hebrew of the entire 150 psalms, we find in Psalms 1-41 the word Jehovah used 272 times, and Elohim "God" 15 times; Psalms 42-84, Elohim is used 176 times, and Jehovah only 46 times; while in Psalms 85-150, Jehovah is used 339 times and Elohim of the true God only once.

All of this evidence is cumulative to the effect that there was an active revisional and editorial spirit in the preservation of the psalter, and one that must be reckoned with in any exhaustive study of this "heart of the Bible."

The Book of Proverbs was, of course, collected out of the wisest sayings of the wise men, beginning with Solomon. It is said that Solomon spoke 3,000 proverbs; but the Book of Proverbs as it now stands contains altogether less than 1,000. Furthermore, after we pass the first twenty-four chapters, we have several additions to the great body. Chapter 25:1 reads: "These also are proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah copied out"; chapter 30:1, "The words of Agur, the son of Jakeh, the oracle;" chapter 31:1, "The words of King Lemuel, the oracle which his mother taught him." These superscriptions inform us that these supplementary chapters were added at some time subsequent to the uniting of the main body of the book, and were gathered from various sources.

The Book of Job will never cease to weary the student by its unending problems. The prologue in prose, and the epilogue in prose, and the Book with its semi-dramatic form, give us a production that is unique in every way.

Now, what is the meaning of this bird's eye view of the form of Old Testament literature? This question can scarcely be answered without a glance at some of the elements of form in other Oriental literature. When

we turn to the documents and records of ancient Egypt we discover that almost all of them are such as were originally produced, and were practically, if not entirely, unchanged by later ages. They recite the heroic deeds of a king or of a high official, and stop there. The texts that prescribed the duties of a priest or scribe belong, as a rule, to one age, without much editorial revision of subsequent days. To this general principle there was one notable exception, the "Book of the Dead." This famous religious document—the most important in all Egyptian lore—was written, revised, interpolated and re-revised to answer the demands of each successive age through thousands of years, until the jumble of its vocabulary, its idioms and its syntax has made it one of the most difficult documents to translate into plain English.

The inscriptions of Babylon, Assyria, Elam and Persia are not compilations as a rule. They are made up of single inscriptions of kings, priests or scribes that have for their purpose the laudation of the author or promoter. They have no high historical or moral motive, but are rather intended to perpetuate the valor and greatness of some official. In other words, we find no history proper, carefully collected and compiled among these Oriental peoples. What they have left us is good material as far as it goes for us of later days to work over, and by eliminating self-laudation, bombast, and exaggeration, to construct a history.

As soon as we turn from these single local documents, historical, personal and commercial, to the religious and legal texts, we discover that they have been the result of long experience, of varied regulations, and of many writers. The codified laws of Hammurabi, and the religious rituals of temple service, have many points in common with the form and content of the provisions of the Pentateuch, and show us as did the Egyptian Book of the Dead, that the religious and legal literature of Israel's great neighbors, as of themselves, occupied their

chief attention, and carries the marks of the most scrupulous care in its perpetuation. The most introspective and psalm-like religious texts of Babylonia are poetry, not as majestic in form as our psalter, but still poetic and often truly supplicatory in tone, revealing a vast similarity between the Semitic mind of Babylonia and that found living on the hills of Judea.

III.

The content of these literatures has been partially mentioned, because in some instances it has been difficult to draw a hard and fast line between form and content. This theme must be greatly condensed, as I am already reaching the limits of my space and time. I shall begin with the stories of Genesis and proceed down through the Old Testament citing only some phases here and there.

The creation accounts of Genesis are paralleled by documents of Babylon. While the Genesis account tells a straightforward story in which God is the creator of the heavens and the earth, of the sea-monsters and man, the Babylonian story attributes all creation to the god Marduk, who was only one of the great divinities of the Babylonian pantheon.

The next item in Genesis most completely paralleled in the cuneiform inscription is the account of the flood. The content, even to the birds sent out to search for dry ground, is almost a duplication of Genesis—the chief differences being: first, in the reasons for the causing of a deluge, and second, in the presence in Genesis of one God, and in the Babylonian of many deities.

The contents of the legal literature, particularly of the civil laws of Ex. 21-23, and many others scattered through to the end of Deut. have found many parallels in the code of Hammurabi, codified about 1,000 years before Moses led Israel out of Egypt. Indeed it seems that some of these laws must have been statutes that were in common use among the great Semitic peoples of those

centuries. The existence of them in a code of 2250 B. C. and in the Pentateuch is extremely significant, first, as touching Israel's relations with the nations of that day, and second, the method by which the codes of the Pentateuch were produced. Scores of questions arise right here that would require a whole course of lectures to furnish adequate answers.

The historical literature has been already discussed at some length, and I have shown that its contents are not history in any real or modern sense of that term, but a description of personages and events covering continuously a portion of Israel's activity, out of which the writer could draw a moral and religious lesson. In other words, the history contained in the Old Testament is a moral or religious history of Israel, such as could be used with telling effect in subsequent times. Of this peculiar character of Old Testament literature there is no exact parallel in the literature of the great peoples of ancient days.

Of the contents of the prophetical literature, we have no parallel that deserves mention. The transcendent utterances of the great religious leaders of Israel stand alone, as the sublimest literary documents of the pre-Christian centuries.

But the poetic literature, stamped with the form of true Semitic rhythm, finds its parallels both in Babylonia and in Arabia. The lofty sentiment of a penitent soul, expressed in poetical form, is seen in the following from a Babylonian psalm: "O my God, who art angry with me, accept my prayers! O my God, who art wroth with me, receive my supplication. He who guideth the span of life, who stayeth the hand of death, my God, accept my prayer. Forgive my sins, and I will humble myself before thee. May my sins be forgiven, may my transgressions be forgotten! May the ban be loosened, may the chains be cast off! . . . . . May the seven winds carry away my sight."

"Make me bright like gold!
Like a string of diamonds may I be precious in thy sight!
Cleanse me from wickedness, save my soul!
I will watch thy court and pledge myself to thee!"
(*Assyrian-Babylonia Literature,* p. 438).

These marvellous sentiments, many of them parallel in thought to the psalms of David, show us that men were moved by similar motives whether in Babylonia or in the hills of Palestine. Their recognition of guilt, desire for forgiveness, and joy in the presence of divinity were almost equally fervid on the Euphrates or on the east shores of the Mediterranean Sea. But the one far-reaching and fundamental difference consists in the monotheism of Israel's psalms and the rank polytheism of the verses from Babylonia.

Let us now summarize some of the points touched upon in this brief survey of the theme. The discoveries of the past three-quarters of a century have brought to light great masses of literature autecedent to, and contemporaneous with, ancient Israel. The existence of such documents argues for literary ability and productivity in Israel from the earliest times. It likewise prepares us to expect Israel to preserve her own records of events, thoughts and aspirations. Evidence shows that Israel possessed a class of men whose business it was to prepare and preserve her annals, the biographies of her great men, and commentaries on her events.

The form of the literature was such as we designate prose and poetry, embracing therein history, prophecy, wisdom and psalm literature. The present form of the history shows that it was compiled out of antecedent documents; the prophecies are arranged on a principle unknown to modern students, and the poetry was collected from a variety of sources.

The contents of the Old Testament narratives in distinction from those of the inscriptions of Babylonia and all other early Eastern nations are permeated with the

idea of the one true God, as over against hosts of lifeless divinities; they abound in moral and religious teaching that is uplifting and ennobling, while the lofty sentiments of the ancient Orient are weighted down by the cringing attitude of the devotees of the polytheism.

Purely as literature then, full of inspiring sentiment, the Old Testament towers far above all the choicest inscriptions of the magnificent civilizations of the long centuries before the coming of the Redeemer Christ.

PERSUASION IN PREACHING; ITS NATURE AND IMPORTANCE.*

BY ARTHUR JONES, D.D., PROFESSOR OF HOMILETICS IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

My only excuse for selecting a second time, the subject of Persuasion for my Opening Address, is the fact that the seven intervening years have, to my mind, emphasized the importance of it both to those who are studying the art, and also to those who are beginning the actual work of preaching. To really preach, is to persuade. Persuasion is the end the preacher should have in view: power of persuasion the thing he should covet; the art of persuasion the thing he should study. The preacher is not a teacher. He should teach, and desire to be "apt to teach;" but always with a view to persuasion. His mission is not merely to present the truth to men, but so to present it that they will obey. The preacher is not a messenger. He should have a message, and should deliver it faithfully "whether they will hear or whether they will forbear;" but he must leave nothing undone, save only tampering with the message, that they shall hear. As he stands "to declare all the counsel of God," his prayer of preparation should be—

> "O Spirit that dost prefer
> Before all temples the upright heart and pure,
> Instruct me. ———————
> What in me is dark,
> Illumine; what is low, raise and support;
> That in the height of this great argument
> I may assert Eternal Providence,
> And *justify* the ways of God to men."

*The Annual Address before the Colgate Seminary, Sept. 26th, 1905.

I.

What is persuasion? Let me say first of all, that persuasion is not a formal thing.

In my boyhood I sat under the preaching of a good man of no mean parts, who, as far as I can now recall, never failed to close his sermons with an appeal to the unsaved; and those appeals always began with the set phrase, "And now my dear unconverted friends." What he said in those appeals I seldom heard; I doubt if any of us did. Just as the benediction is to some people the signal to reach for their hats, so that phrase was to us the signal to stop listening. We stopped primarily I suppose, because he had served notice thereby that he was after us; and we were not disposed to be caught. But it was easy to stop because we had found from the few samples we had tested, that, no matter how interesting the sermon might be up to that point, the rest would consist chiefly of exclamation and platitude. Now the good man had the correct theory, but he was not within sight of the spirit of it. That was no more persuasion, than a wooden nutmeg is a nutmeg. The theory of never closing a sermon without some word to the unsaved, rightly understood and applied, does not, in my opinion, need defense. The exigencies under which every true sermon is delivered demand nothing less. But a formal appeal like that is not a genuine word to the unsaved; and the man who gives it supposing that he is thus performing the high duty of persuasion, has only persuaded himself; into an error. The *form* of persuasion may best be absent sometimes, that the essence of persuasion may be most effectively present.

The story is told that Daniel Webster was once pressing a suit to secure pay for a large order of wagon wheels which his clients had delivered, for which payment had been refused on the ground that the wheels furnished were not as good as the sample. The sample wheel, and

some of those supplied under the contract, were brought into court and placed in evidence. After the witnesses had been examined, the counsel for the defense arose and addressed the jury in a speech constructed after the most approved style. He dwelt upon the sacredness of contracts; and asked what would become of the business interests of the land if men were permitted to violate both spirit and letter, and then recover payment the same as if the contract had been faithfully observed. He described a possible accident which might result from the breaking of one of these inferior wheels; where innocent users were dashed to their death, leaving wives and children in sorrow and poverty. He appealed to the jury as honest men who knew their duty, to faithfully discharge their trust and rebuke this shameless attempt at fraud. When he had finished, Mr. Webster arose, and, after formally addressing the court, turned to the jury, and pointing to the wheels, said, "Gentlemen of the jury, look at 'em;" and resumed his seat. Tradition has it that the jury gave him the verdict without leaving the box. The formal appeal was absent, but the essential principles of persuasion were observed. He showed faith in his case, and confidence in the jury. His opponent appealed without persuading; he persuaded without appealing. It was the height of the art of persuasion.

It was my privilege to hear Charles H. Spurgeon and another well-known preacher of London, in their own pulpits, on the same Sabbath. I have not forgotten the object-lesson presented regarding methods of persuasion. Mr. Spurgeon gave a vivid picture of the graciousness of Christ toward his followers, even the weakest. As he went on to portray the considerateness and tenderness of Jesus, the great audience was hushed and weeping. Then the preacher, raising himself to full height and lifting his hand to compel attention, said, "He has appointed me one of his recruiting sergeants, and I have authority to say to every unsaved soul in this Tabernacle: If you want this Christ for your master he bids you welcome."

I do not believe there was one person without the Savior that heard those words who did not receive an impulse to seek him then and there. That evening we listened to the other well-known preacher. The sermon, addressed to young men, was one of rare beauty and tenderness. It too presented Christ faithfully and attractively; closing with an appeal to young men, in the fullness of their strength, with all their wealth of physical and mental powers, to consecrate them to the Master. "He needs you in the contest that is waging. Your strong right arm can carry his banner far to the front. The world needs you; the world's Savior needs you. Oh, I beseech you consecrate those powers you possess to the Master's service. Turn from selfish pursuits and aid the world's rightful King to come to his own." Such, as nearly as I can recall, were the final words. All very beautiful, and uttered in tenderest tones; but I said to my companion as we left the chapel, "I don't believe that appeal scratched the surface of the purpose of one young man present." Mr. Spurgeon, perhaps, was at his best that morning, it was the last sermon he ever preached; the other may have been at his weakest that evening. My purpose is not to compare the men, only this—the one without seeming to try, persuaded; the other tried hard, and failed. Possibly it was more in the way of saying it than in the thing said; possibly it was in my mood, with which you will not sympathize; but the impression remains after fourteen years. The one seemed like the deferential presentation of a contribution bag; the other like the proffering of a royal invitation on a tray of pure gold.

No, persuasion is not a formal thing, so many lines of appeal, so many words of expostulation and entreaty; there may be all these, and no persuasion; there may be none of these, and yet persuasion irresistible.

The fashion in public utterance changes like fashion in other things. It is simpler and more familiar than it was a hundred or even fifty years ago. For my part I rejoice in the change. I regard the recoil from the old form

of appeals as both healthy and necessary. Healthy because the old appeals would be unreal; necessary, because this age will not listen to them. But, unless I mistake, the recoil has gone altogether too far. The pulpit of today has, turned, as it seems to me, not only from the old forms of persuasion; it has turned, or is in danger of turning, from persuasion itself. The new conception of preaching seems to place the intellect or the sensibilities rather than the will at the center. Homiletically this is rank heresy; resulting in the lowering of the position of the pulpit, and the diminishing of its power.

Now there have been equally great changes in speech as related to worldly matters; but the children of the world have been wiser than the children of light. They too have changed their methods; but they have not lost sight of the thing to be done. Take for example the selling of goods. The old merchant, when once a possible customer crossed the threshold of his store, wrestled with him by the hour to make a sale. He flattered, browbreat, pleaded, reduced the price, anything to sell. Now all this is changed—except the purpose to sell. And the mad rush on bargain days witnesses to the fact that the people are still being persuaded to buy. Lest this should seem to prove too much for my purpose, and appear to be an argument for the substitution of something else in the place of preaching, I would remind you that the great wholesale houses throughout the land rely more than ever upon the personal touch and the winning word. The great army of commercial travelers is increasing faster in proportion, than the population or the volume of business; and you do not need to be told what tireless students of the art of persuasion these "Knights of the Road" are. In some matters the preacher may well learn from them. Among other things, they might teach him that there is a time for speech, and a time for silence —but both with a view to persuasion. And thus it is clear, to me at least, that in all the changes that take place in tastes and methods, the aim and purpose of

preaching remains the same. It is to persuade men.

II.

What then is persuasion? I answer, (and students of Broadus will note that I am giving a judgment not a definition), persuasion is the intelligent dominance of a definite purpose to persuade; influencing the spirit, manner and matter of a speaker. Persuasion employs all proper methods; it is bound to none. It is free in its choice of means; it is in bondage to a single end. It does many things; but it does them that it may do the one thing more effectively. The foundation of persuasion lies deep. It is in the spirit and temper of the man; in his attitude toward his fellows; in his conception of his work.

I say that an appropriate spirit belongs to persuasion. The purpose to persuade tends, on the one hand, to produce this spirit; and, on the other, by emphasizing its importance, to compel the man to seek for it constantly and earnestly. Persuasion inclines toward gentleness rather than sternness; it wooes more than it commands; it pleads with, but does not denounce; it grieves over, but does not despise.

Now this spirit which belongs to true persuasion, determines the attitude of a real preacher toward his fellows. This spirit, controlling conduct and utterance, will tend to place him in right relations with men; and his relations with men, rightly conceived, will lead him to long for, and cultivate this spirit. Persuasion must be in the man before it is in the sermon. It is a spirit that pervades the sermon; not a mould in which the sermon is cast.

I said also that persuasion had to do with a man's conception of his work. Now there are diversities of gifts; some pastors, some evangelists, some teachers. A call to do Christian work is general; a call to preach is specific. Some successful ministers, it would seem, were never called to preach; or, if they were, have failed to do much of it. Every successful minister is called to do many

things besides to preach. The most successful ministers are called primarily to preach; and they do it. They may be excellent pastors, efficient organizers, apt teachers; but their throne is their pulpit. And preaching is persuasion; and where that is, and is sought, you have definiteness of conception of one's work. Perhaps some of you brethren of the student body are, as yet, conscious only of the general call to serve Christ; but if you believe you have a commission to preach, then welcome the limitations imposed, and prepare to do your work; not something else.

He who is to become a persuader of men for God, needs a varied preparation in order that he may do this well. He needs a thorough training in elocution. The most faithful practice is worth while. Read the testimony of Mr. Beecher, given to the Yale students, regarding his own painstaking work in this direction; and if it was of value to him, who may wisely dispense with it? But, he is not to become an elocutionist. He must be a careful student of style; compelling the great writers and speakers to share with him their secrets. But, he is not to become a mere stylist. The preacher should be familiar with the great movements in the Christian church. But, he is not to become a specialist in church history. The principles of interpretation demand his devoted study. He must, if possible, be able to read his Bible in the original tongues; for the most effective preaching is always biblical. But, he is to be the maker of expository sermons, not expositions. Over the profound themes of Christian theology he must brood, and agonize, and pray. But, even here he may build no home; he is not to be a discoverer of truth, but a disseminator of truth. The great verities as revealed in the Divine Word, and verified by his own experience and the Christian consciousness, these he is to persuade men to accept and live. His passion is not to know; but to know, that he may tell. The angel of his vision did not point up the mountain, to the hiding place of great treasure; but down to the valley, filled with starving men. He longs to know of that treasure, but if

he finds it, he will not stay there to exploit its wealth; but, seizing as much as he can carry, will rush back to save his dying parish.

The art of persuasion is not something peculiar to preaching, but is of general use in life. The child turns to it early, and often acquires an adroitness in its use that is the marvel of those who have forgotten about their own childhood; the man who sells or buys reduces it to an exact science; and the traditions of the bar abound with instances of the triumphs of famous pleaders. But there is one thing about persuasion as employed by the true preacher that is unique. The merchant persuades that he may sell his goods; the lawyer to win his case; but the true preacher only that he may do men good. It is as if the merchant forgot his own profits, and sought only to send into the homes of his customers those things that would minister to their comfort and well-being. It is as if the lawyer sought only to persuade the jury only to do right.

I have in my library a book that held a place of honor on the parlor table in my father's house. It is a life of Adoniram Judson. Stamped in gold on the cover is a design representing Mr. Judson preaching to a native of Burma; and beneath are the words of Paul: "I seek not yours, but you." That expresses the characteristic of true preaching—seeking men only to do them good. Persuading them into the kingdom, not to add to personal success, not to strengthen one's denomination or church; but solely to do them good. The best missionary sermons even, are those that are prepared with less thought about an increased collection, than about enlarged hearts. We seek not yours but you; your best good; your salvation; your growth in Christly character. This is the one motive in all real preaching. Alas, the inward shame that comes with the discovery of the base alloys that are mixed with the gold of our devotion; and we realize that we are not better preachers, because we are not better men.

I presume that here are some good people who would be disposed to quarrel with me because I place this motive of seeking the good of men at the center of true preaching, instead of placing there the glory of God. Well, I will not quarrel with them, for if they understand what I mean, and what the glory of God means, there is nothing to quarrel about. These two things are one. Whatever is for man's good is always for God's glory. God's glory is like the rays of the sun; which at the same time are the sun's glory, and the earth's health. And I have justification for stating the motive thus from God's own expression of his thought. "And God said to Jonah, Should I not spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?" God was thinking, not of himself, but of the Ninevites—yes, and of their cattle. He was grieved that his servant should so easily forget men, while thinking of his own reputation as a prophet. When one has caught something of the real significance of the death of Christ for a lost world, to place man's good as the central motive of preaching, is but to express the Divine thought in human terms.

III.

I have thus attempted to present a few judgments regarding the essential nature of persuasion, in the hope of inciting my young brethren to study the art of it; and make it characteristic of their preaching. According to the plan I had in mind for this address, it remains for me now, only to show the importance of persuasion because of the effect of a definite purpose to persuade upon the preacher himself.

1. And first I ask you to note that such a purpose, clearly conceived, tends to give an exalted conception of the worth of man.

What is this being for whom one is to subordinate his literary culture and love of learning? for whose sake,

even the truth is to be sought, rather than for its own? this being whose persuasion for God is the supreme thing to which we are consecrated? These are questions that will press for an answer.

It seems natural for men not to place a very high estimate upon men. However well we may regard ourselves and some other men, we are not disposed to hold men in general as being of very great worth. If it is not natural to thus judge, it certainly is very easy. Many men are weak; many are ignorant; many seem devoid of high moral sense; most are selfish; some are cruel; some are swayed by bestial passions. Not long ago, in our own land, men bought and sold men. To-day they are used like machines; driven like beasts; fleeced and befooled for other men's profit. Mr. Barnum professed to believe that the public liked to be humbugged; the merchant laughs at the gullibility of the bargain hunter; the lawyer laughs at the jury he twists around his finger; and the politician writes it as a part of his creed that the people are mostly fools—and the rest knaves.

How men are divided into classes, and set over against each other! First there are the great racial divisions; then the national; and within these the political, social, economic, intellectual, moral, and even religious—the one despising, or suspecting, or hating, or patronizing the other; but nowhere reverence for man, because he is man. Even that ringing line of Robert Burns,

"A man 's a man for a' that,"

is after all, not a note of recognition of man's essential dignity as man, but the defiant answer that "Honest Poverty" flings back at the pretensions of mere wealth and rank.

And men are so hard to help. So blind to their highest interests; so base in their ingratitudes; so fickle in their attachments; so feeble in the setting of their wills toward the good; so strong in their love for sin. The reformer struggles with them for a while, and then gives up in disgust. The righteous prophet, flaming with hatred for sin,

ends by hating the sinner too.

But with God all this is different. He loves, not only men, but man; not only Enoch and Abraham and David, but man. Not only Israel, but all flesh. He has made him in his own image, and placed him in the seat of honor. This was the marvel of the writer of the eighth psalm:

"When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
What is man, that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?

For thou hast made him but little lower than God;
And crownest him with glory and honor.
Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands;
Thou hast put all things under his feet."

And amid the awful havoc sin has wrought, God does not despair; the very greatness of the ruin, but reminds him of man's inherent dignity. In the wreckage of the fair temple, he sees "the beams still overlaid with gold; and the stones set with costly jewels." He will not give him up. No, not that, but this—he was not taken unawares; he saw this from the beginning; he counted the cost before he made him a living soul. Nothing in heaven shall be esteemed too precious to be used in the rescue. From the foundation of the world he prepared himself a lamb for the sacrifice, in the person of his only begotten Son. The Psalmist was amazed that God should set man over the works of his hands; what would he have thought if he could have seen Calvary?

This is God's estimate of man. And God makes no mistakes; he knows values. Oh, a wondrous race is in the making here! Through pain and tears, through struggle and burden bearing, and, through the blood of the cross, there is coming forth a people for God's own possession—created by himself, and then redeemed by himself—for himself. And eligibility comes not from birth or any

earthly accident—it comes from just being a man. God will work this miracle of grace on any man who does not hinder him.

This is God's estimate of man; and in some real sense it must become the estimate of every one who is a successful persuader of men for God. Martin Luther's old teacher used to salute his boys as he entered the schoolroom, because among them there might be the future leaders. He saluted a possibility; the possibility that a leader in the making might be there. The real preacher has learned a better lesson. As he stands before men, he salutes them. He too salutes a possibility, but in another sense; not the possibility that *may be,* but that *is* in every human soul.

2. Helping to a true conception of the worth of man, the purpose to persuade will help also to develop a sympathy with man. There can be no persuasion without this; and very necessity will compel the seeking for it. But there will be better aid than the whip of necessity; for appreciation begets sympathy. Believing in men, creates a desire to understand them. To know their point of view; their hopes and fears; their struggles; and their enemies of every sort. Dull people become interesting, repulsive people attractive, if we can look, ever so little, through God's eyes at the men he loves.

3. And when appreciation of the worth of man has come, and with it, sympathy with him; then will come also something of the mind that was in Christ Jesus when he took upon himself the form of a servant. The service of man will appear, what it really is, a high honor.

What strange changes love works. The missionary lately come to his far-off field, surrounded by strange people and barbarous sights, puts it in his prayer that he may be permitted, please God, to go home to die surrounded by those who are of his own blood and color and speech. But after he has served a third or a half of a century, then, home—where is it, but where he has done his work? And his own people—who, if not those who

are his own children in the Gospel,—"his joy and his crown." He prefers now to have their dusky hands minister to him in the last hours; and close his eyes when dead.

To such a career, brethren of the Seminary, you are looking forward. I offer you my congratulations. And when the work of redemption has been completed, and the time for the manifestation of the sons of God has arrived, may it be yours to stand in the presence of the King, surrounded by a goodly company of those, who through your persusation, have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

BOOK REVIEWS.

I. CHURCH HISTORY.

The Disciples of Christ.

By Errett Gates, Ph. D., Associate in Church History, University of Chicago. New York. The Baker & Taylor Co. 1905.

This little volume of 346 pages belongs to "The Story of the Churches" series, for which the Baptist volume was prepared by Professor Vedder. Dr. Gates represents the most advanced thought of his denomination and his attitude toward Baptists is irenic in the highest degree. While he has a very high appreciation of the ability of Alexander Campbell as a controversialist and a party leader, he is fully alive to his weaknesses and extravagances, and still more so to those of many of his contemporaries and successors, who without his genius have carried to extremes the most objectionable phases of his teachings. He does full justice, I think, to the Baptists in his narration of the controversies and proceedings that led to Campbell's separation from the Baptists as whose champion he had for some years been regarded and who had built up a widespread influence among them. Referring to the application of Campbell's maxim: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent," our author remarks: "The principle had both a positive and negative application. It was with respect to the 'order of things' that they were chiefly concerned. It was a simpler task to put into practice the ritual precepts and examples of the New Testament than its ethical and spiritual precepts and examples. They were not oblivious to the fact that the N. T. taught a 'spirit of things' as well as an 'order of things' but they joined issue upon the order. They found that the Scriptures not only spoke of the Lord's supper as being celebrated on the first day of the week, and of baptism as an immersion or burial in water, and of deacons and

elders as constituting the official organization of the local church, and of reception of persons into the church upon a confession of their faith and baptism—all of which they put into practice; but they also found that the Scriptures spoke of the holy kiss, of feet washing, of mutual exhortation in public meetings, of the 'amen' at the close of the prayer, of eating the Lord's supper in the evening, of baptism in streams of water, of kneeling in prayer, of community of goods, of the silence of women in churches—all of which were tried in various churches in the beginning, but never with the approval of the leaders. These things were regarded as 'the circumstantials of Christian worship,' which should be treated with freedom and forbearance. The Baptists, however, could not tell where the principle would lead them, for it was capable of endless application and experiment. . . While each church was perfectly free and independent, there was one master mind, one controlling genius, who was leading them. He spoke through the pages of the *Christian Baptist*. The mind and personality of Alexander Campbell dominated the entire movement. After he had spoken there was no use for any one else to speak. . . But these Reformers respected the 'silence of Scripture' quite as much as the 'speech of Scripture.' This plunged them into extravagances and extremes in the other direction, much to the annoyance and alarm of the Baptists. Where there was not a 'Thus saith the Lord' for a Baptist belief or usage, there was ready a 'Thus saith the Reformer' *against* it, and the Scriptures were made to speak quite as loudly against some things as for other things. One after another the cherished customs and institutions of the Baptist order were swept away, as having no sanction in the word of God, and there was no telling what would go next. There was no precept or example in the N. T. for the use of creeds as bonds of fellowship, or for the examination of converts as to their Christian experience, or for ministerial calls, clerical authority, associations of churches, missionary societies, Bible societies, tract

societies or Sunday-schools. Wherever the new reformation prevailed all these things were done away. No wonder it looked like disorganization and anarchy to a Baptist who was not captivated by it. What response but opposition could be expected on the part of a strong, established, and respectable body, such as the Baptist denomination, to the inroads of such lawlessness? Whether in the majority or the minority the faithful among the Baptists stood up in defense of their system" (p. 154-158).

The author's description of the process of separation is informing, graphic, objective. The following sentences indicate clearly his attitude to the matter of separation: "To the degree that the Reformers urged the Baptists to give up their creeds, their doctrines, and human inventions, to that degree they held on to them and discovered new reasons for holding on. In this controversy as in most controversies, where there is truth and honesty on both sides, and error and prejudice on both sides, it is difficult, if not impossible, to say which side should surrender. In this, as always, it was fought out to the bitter end. Since that time the Baptists have given up their creeds, have modified their Calvinism, their requirements of an examination and experience for membership in the church, and have reduced the authority of associations; while the Reformers as 'Disciples of Christ' have given up their opposition to missionary, Bible, and tract societies, salaried clergy, association of churches, have recoiled from the literalism of the authority of primitive precept and example, and above all have sweetened in spirit towards those that differ from them. Such modifications and moderations did not seem possible to the parties in the midst of the conflict." (p. 175-6).

Dr. Gates shows, with full command of facts, that from 1813-30 the "Reformers" worked almost exclusively among Baptists, and how having been cast out and disowned by the Baptists, Campbell, contrary to his wishes and professions, instead of leading a great undenomi-

national, unifying movement, was obliged to organize his followers into a separate denomination, which was to take its place side by side with the denominations whose existence as such he considered unwarrantable. It was natural that even now he should choose for his fellow-believers a neutral name that would carry with it the semblance of non-partisanship. Campbell preferred the name "Christian," the followers of B. W. Stone preferred the designation "Disciples of Christ." Both titles are still used by different sections of the denomination.

The union of Campbell's immediate followers with like-minded parties that had arisen somewhat independently under other leaders is well described, as is also the "Early Growth and Organization" of the denomination. The chapter on "The Rise of Internal Controversy" shows interestingly how the schism occurred between those who insisted on carrying out, without Campbell's intelligence and vitality, his most extreme teachings regarding rejection of human institutions and literalistic adherence to Scriptural precept, and those that came to see the need of following other denominations in the use of human means for the diffusion of the truth. In the progressive movement Isaac Errett was the leader. Errett's maxim was: "Let the bond of union among the baptized be Christian character in place of orthodoxy —right doing in place of exact thinking."

Chapters follow on "Missionary Organization," "Evangelism, Journalism, Education, and Church Growth," and "Recent Tendencies and Problems." This last treats in an appreciative way of the growth of liberal sentiments in the denomination and the growing tendency to cultivate the friendliest relations with other denominations and to participate in the great general movements for the promotion of religion and of moral reform. Special attention is called to the education of a large number of young ministers of the denomination in Harvard, Yale, and Union Theological Seminary, the establishment of the Divinity House in connection with

the University of Chicago, with H. L. Willett, who had been educated at Yale, as dean, and the appointment of several of these scholars educated under liberalizing influences to presidencies and professorships in the institutions of the denomination, as indications that liberalism is making rapid advances in spite of the denunciations of the denominational press.

The author closes with these significant words: "There is new hope for union in the increasing agreement among all Christians to regard Christianity as something essentially spiritual and ethical, and therefore universal and practical. The hope of a universal unity lies in the spiritual. The one lesson of this history is, that the letter destroys unity while the spirit makes it alive."

Baylor Theological Seminary.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN...

Balthasar Hübmaier. The Leader of the Anabaptists. By Henry C. Vedder, Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1905.

This is another volume of the admirable series of "Heroes of the Reformation," edited by Prof. Samuel Macauley Jackson. It is in all respects a worthy companion to its predecessors in the series and constitutes one of the most important works on the Anabaptists that has yet appeared in English. In fact it is the first adequate treatment of the life of any Anabaptist leader which has been offered to English readers. Hübmaier was beyond question the ablest and sanest of the Anabaptist leaders, gathering up into his system the best elements of the movement while rejecting its extravagances. Prof. Vedder has presented us an admirable study of the man and that part of the entire movement with which he had to do. In this work he had the use of the excellent productions of Loserth and Hoschek who preceded him in this field. He made large use of the results of their labors of course, but has proceeded in a thoroughly independent manner. He has made a careful study of the sources, has visited

the scenes of the story, and often dissents from the opinions of the biographers named. The facts of Hübmaier's life are related in the clear, graphic style for which Prof. Vedder is noted, and the whole of the life is brought into its proper relations to the Anabaptists and to the larger movements of history. Space does not permit an extended account of this excellent work, but a few things will be of interest.

On the question of the act of baptism Prof. Vedder finds that Hübmaier practiced affusion throughout his life, p. 143; "that the Swiss Anabaptists began with the practice of affusion, but soon generally adopted immersion, seems to be the most probable conclusion from all the facts accessible. Elewhere we find definite proofs of immersion only among the Anabaptists of Augsburg, and in Poland, where the practice was introduced in 1575," p. 144. "The later Anabaptists, known as Mennonites, seem to have consistently practised affusion from the first —at least there is no case known to the contrary, except the congregation at Rhynsburg, which began to practice immersion in 1620," p. 145.

As to Hübmaier's spirit and ability the author says, "As a man of letters, Hübmaier deserves to be ranked along with Erasmus and Melanchthon—as a man of letters, be it noted, not as a scholar," p. 155. "It is his power of expression, his sense of literary form, his art of putting things, that sets him alongside of Erasmus," p. 156. "The ethical tone of Hübmaier's writings also marks him for distinction among the writers of his age. He is scrupulously fair to his adversaries," p. 157, in this respect differing from all the great leaders of his time. He was a master in the Scriptures and even modern scholarship has little fault to find with his interpretations.

The value of the work is greatly increased by the quotation at length of many of Hübmaier's more important writings, setting forth with force and distinctness his peculiar views. A further feature of value is a large number of excellent cuts taken from superb photographs

and old cuts that make the scenes of the subject's life live again before us. All in all Prof. Vedder has done a most excellent piece of work and it ought to be widely read among us. W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

Early Eastern Christianity.

By F. Crawford Burkitt, Lecturer in Palæography in the University of Cambridge. St. Margaret's Lectures 1904 on the Syriac-Speaking Church. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York. 1904. pp. 228.

Christianity rose in close proximity to the great Syriac-speaking population of Western Asia. In fact Jesus himself and his disciples probably spoke a dialect of this family of languages. The Jew soon turned away from the new teaching and the new Master, but it is known that the Syriac world was early and deeply moved by Christianity. And yet little that is definite and valuable has been known about the church in these regions and among these people. We have known that Edessa was the new missionary center and that the church had considerable vigor and strength, but little more. Hence the welcome we accord these lectures. The author is familiar with all that can now be known concerning this church and has made careful use of his scant material. He has chapters on "The Early Bishops of Edessa," "The Bible in Syriac," "The Early Syriac Theology," "Marriage and the Sacraments," "Bardaisan and His Disciples," and "The Acts of Judas, Thomas and the Hymn of the Soul." The author studies these various subjects in detail and lays before us much curious information in this short treatise. These lectures constitute perhaps the best treatise on the subject. W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

Political History of Europe From 1815 to 1848.
Based on Continental Authorities.

By B. H. Carroll, Jr., LL. B., M. A., Th. D., Ph. D. (Berole), etc. Baylor University Press, Waco, Texas.

This work of over 200 pages is devoted to one of the most interesting and important periods in modern his-

tory. The work is intended primarily for university students but is worthy of a wider reading. It "does not pretend to be more than a compilation from the best and most accessible and usually untranslated continental authorities." The author puts into attractive and convenient form for American students the work which the great German historians have done in this period. He was a brilliant student in the University of Berlin and belongs to that school of historians—"political historians," Lamprecht calls them. He places a high estimate on the place of politics in modern history, in the opinion of the reviewer too high an estimate. On page 15 he says: "Modern History is then externally, practically, diplomacy with the soft voice of Jacob but with the hairy sinewy hand of Esau that holds a naked two-mouthed sword; internally it is the story of parties and partisanship." If that is a just definition of modern history, then modern history does not tell us much about the life of the people with whom it deals. Political history is but one department of history, a very interesting and important department, capable of easy and dramatic treatment, but only a department. Professor Carroll has mastered his authorities and writes with the freedom and force of one who is at home in his subject. His work is in no sense a slavish compilation; it is his own work. His style is vigorous, clear and vivid. He is never dull. His work is somewhat marred by occasional colloquialisms, exaggerations, German idioms and untranslated phrases, while the proof-reading was very badly done, due, as the author explains in a note, to the haste with which it must be finished.

This is not the first publication of its brilliant young author. It is a delight to welcome a book of this kind from one of our Southern professors. Our colleges are laying more and more stress upon history and it is to be hoped that we shall soon see much productive scholarship among our professors of history.

W. J. McGlothlin.

Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt.

Von Hermann Barge. Friedrich Brandstetter, Leipzig. 1905. 2 volumes.

The most notable of Martin Luther's early coadjutors was Karlstadt or Carlstadt as we are accustomed to spell the name in English. Nearly the same age as Luther he studied in the same university, that of Erfurt. He began his career as a teacher in the University of Wittenberg in 1505, three years before Luther came thither. Their development toward the acceptance of new views and the break with the old church was on parallel lines. Indeed for some time Carlstadt seems to have been the more influential and prominent of the two. But Luther was by far the more powerful personality, and from 1517 on gradually forged ahead. Carlstadt, however, grasped the principle of the absolute authority of the Scriptures earlier and more firmly than Luther. He was decidedly more radical than his great colleague, and was ready to do in 1521 what Luther did not do until 1525. This difference led to an estrangement between these two friends, reformers and professors of the same university in the early years of the Reformation. Carlstadt was driven from the university in 1522 and spent the remainder of his long life at various places as pastor and professor. He departed from the prevailing Lutheran doctrine on several important articles and in some points agreed with the Anabaptists. For this reason he was compelled to endure untold abuse from his contemporaries, and has failed to receive from modern German historians the attention he deserved. They judged him largely through the eyes of Luther and hence neglected or abused him. The present work is the first adequate treatment that Carlstadt has ever received. It is possibly somewhat too favorable, though the author does not spare his subject's weakness. The views of Carlstadt are studied in minute detail in a thorough German fashion which is sometimes too detailed for easy or popular reading. Incidentally one sees Luther in a new light which is not at

all flattering. Henceforth this work will be, at least for many years, the chief authority on Carlstadt and that interesting phase of the German Reformation. It is a contribution to the history of the highest value.

W. J. McGlothlin.

II. CHRISTIAN LIFE.

God's Image in Man.

By James Orr, D. D. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905.

The Inward Light.

By Amory H. Bradford, D. D. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York. 1905. $1.20.

Life and Light.

By George Dana Boardman, D. D. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia. 1905.

The books here grouped as akin in subject matter and symptomatic of the thinking of the times are sharply differentiated in manner of approach and treatment. Broadly speaking they all deal with 'the newest thinking' of the day, the first with the theological, the second with the spiritual, and the third with the vital and practical phase of it. Dr. Orr avowedly sets himself against "the newer tendency to surrender vital aspects of Christian doctrine at the shrine of what is regarded as 'the modern view of the world,'" boldly declaring that in many respects the Christian view of the world is not the so-called modern view; in fact, is irreconcilable with it, and that we ought to have the courage to avow this and take the consequences. Dr. Bradford clearly accepts "the modern view of the world" and is willing to take the consequences theologically; but he calls for an ampler definition and a new application of the law of evolution, and a new and fuller recognition of "the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." His book represents and pleads for a renascence of Quakerism. The posthumous work of Dr. Boardman is composed of choice and characteristic thoughts from his writings

clustered about Paul's definition of life: "To me to live is Christ," and John's words of Jesus: "In Him was life and the life was the Light of men;" followed by forty-four pages of memorabilia. Dr. Orr does not believe that the Christian view of the world is irreconcilable with true science or sound philosophy, but he shows in a masterful way that it is irreconcilable with many of the theories that profess to be based on science and philosophy; carrying the war into Africa and disclosing the utter conflict of Biblical and modern views of Man and Sin, of the Origin and Primitive Condition of Man, of Man and Sin in Relation to Redemption, the Restoration and Perfecting of the Divine Image, etc., etc. Dr. Bradford though his chapters were nearly all written before Sabatier's notable volume, "The Religions of Authority vs. The Religion of the Spirit" had appeared, avows similar convictions, though reached along a different path, and likewise finds the source of authority within the soul and not in church, or creed, or book.

He makes a strong and cumulative plea for a more courageous, consistent and all-embracing recognition of the Inward Light, the Immanent God, and the Continuous Leadership of the Spirit, contending that the Inward Light is from God, who dwells in humanity as He is immanent in the universe, and that it may be implicitly trusted. Dr. Boardman in these selections, as in all his writings, evinces his realization of the fact, that spiritual experience and truth are greater than any expression of them, that in all forms of sincere faith and art and life there is some bit of the Christ, some measure of spiritual truth; and that Christianity is larger, not only than any particular denomination, but, also larger than 'the church universal.' So while thoroughly loyal to his own denomination, he is generosity itself in dealing with others, and keen to distinguish between things vital and things formal, things transient and things eternal.

The first book is analytical, argumentative and largely polemical, being addressed to the philosophical or theo-

logical thinker; the second is mystical, poetical, and, in contrast with the first, vague, but only so far, it may be claimed, as mysticism, poetry and vagueness are necessary characteristics of that truth of spirit and experience which transcends exactness of definition and logic; and the third, while utterly non-polemical and irenic, is varied enough in its addresses, studies and outlines to be thought-provoking and inspiring to all classes of readers. The memorabilia is made up of glowing appreciations and character delineations by many friends and admirers of the scholarly and lovable Dr. Boardman. The devout soul will find abundant food for thought and rich spiritual nutriment in all three volumes, read separately or together.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Happy Life.

By Charles W. Eliot, LL. D. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York

Faith and Life.

By Charles E. Jefferson. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York. 1905.

Rational Living.

By Henry Churchill King. The MacMillan Co., New York. 1905. $1.25.

Here are three books that we have found it interesting and suggestive to consider together. The first, by President Eliot, of Harvard, ante-dated Pastor Wagner's 'Simple Life,' by six years, in a plea for simplicity of living quite as masterful, some think, as that which has been so industriously exploited and so widely read in Wagner's volume. The opinion has even been ventured that it only lacked the recognition given by the President of the United States to Wagner's plea, to make it quite as popular and more powerful! To our mind the difference is essential. President Eliot's plea is for 'the Happy Life' on grounds that are essentially epicurean, even though in conclusion he asks us to consider 'whether the rational conduct of life on the this-world principles he lays down would differ in any important respect from the right conduct of life on the principles of the Christian gospels.' He scouts the doctrine of total

depravity as the invention of a morbid human imagination (p. 25), speaks of 'the Oriental, hot-climate figment that labor is a curse,' asserts that 'the family affections are the ultimate source of civilized man's idea of a loving God,' nowhere intimates any need of a Savior from sin, or of spiritual renewal, in order to perfection of character or true happiness, but coolly says 'we must never distress ourselves because we cannot fully understand the moral principles on which the universe is conducted—an ant might as well expect to understand the constitution of the sun!' Dr. Charles Edward Jefferson, pastor of Broadway Tabernacle, New York, in *Faith and Life,* discourses in a no less rational, but more Christian way, surely, on 'the nature and place of faith in the Christian life,' pointing out that Jesus began his ministry by urging men to believe, and on the last night of his earthly life still had that greatest word upon his lips, 'Believe!' Everywhere He makes the forgiveness of sins, spiritual health, real peace and happiness to be dependent on faith in Him. Faith, however, is not to be confused with credulity, is not the antithesis of reason, is not something occult, esoteric, but something in essence common to all human experience, and in its highest form within reach of the humblest. 'Do you hope for pardon, peace, to be a better, stronger man, to grow more and more into the likeness of Jesus Christ? Then give substance to your hope, and in this way prove that you are a man of faith' (p. 25). In *Rational Living*, President Henry Churchill King, has done this generation a real service in bringing together, out of the riches of wide research, the "four great emphases" of psychological study in popular form, and pointed out their direct practical bearing on the conduct of life. He quotes freely from the masters in psychology, that the reader may judge of the adequacy of the grounds on which are based the practical counsels for rational living, in respect to Growth, Character, Happiness, and Influence; and in conclusion shows that "just these ideal conditions to

which psychology leads us *Christ declares to be actual.*" His work has this shining merit, that he has presented the fundamental facts of psychology, together with the practical counsels which they impose for a life in rational accord with our nature, more comprehensively and completely than any other writer, and yet in such a way as to show their essential harmony with true Christianity.

GEO. B. EAGER.

III. APOLOGETICS AND POLEMICS.

The Reconstruction of Religious Belief.

By W. H. Mallock. Harper & Bros. 1905. New York and London. pp. 303.

The title of this book does not accurately suggest the contents. The author does not discuss the reconstruction of religious belief, but only a reconstruction of the defenses of that belief. By "religious belief" he does not mean Christianity, although the implications at several points are that he is a Christian. He deals with the three fundamental beliefs which lie at at the basis of religion. These are, first, the existence and goodness of God; second, human freedom; and third, immortality.

The author undertakes to meet the teachings of materialistic science in the interest of religion in a new way. He thinks that both the "clerical" and the philosophic attempts to reply to materialism are at fault. The clerical method is at fault in its effort to show that science is incorrect in some of its details when science insists upon nature as a closed system of causes and effects. The philosophers, likewise, fail of the point when they reduce the universe of science to a system of idealism. Both classes of apologists, according to the author aim at the same thing, that is, to establish God's existence and to rescue freedom from the perils of a system which cannot brook its presence in any form. The clerical method fails to disprove the detailed claims of science and subjective idealism, as urged by the philosophers is simply absorbed

by science, which then presents us with a universe with mind in the foreground instead of matter, but equally closed and fixed and exclusive of any real freedom. Accepting all that science teaches as to the universe the author thinks it is possible to show that theism is a necessary implication of all science. Purpose, as it appears in chemical and biological processes, and personality in man, are facts of existence which were provided for in the beginning of things and which can only be accounted for by a reference to intelligence and purpose as the explanation of the world in the first place.

The most satisfactory way to approach the matter, however, Mr. Mallock thinks, is to consider the relation of theistic belief to a progressive civilization. This he does by pointing out that the three ideals of our civilization, the True, the Beautiful and the Good, have their necessary roots in theism. Theism thus appears so fertile as a practical and social principle that its rejection would be to lapse into barbarism.

A glance at one or two of his arguments in detail will indicate his method of proof. The ideals implicit in our modern civilization are, as agreed by all parties, the True, the Beautiful and the Good. Science pursues Truth as its ideal. A psychic fact which governs all human effort is the value of the object sought to the man who seeks. Nature answers this psychic demand of man's nature in two ways. She may yield results of practical value for man's comfort and enjoyment. The discovery of scientific truth promotes human welfare practically. Now, if this be not the implicit desire in man's search for truth, there can be but one other, viz., the discovery in or behind nature of an intelligent Principle or Being, who answers man's need as a companion, who can respond to his intellectual cravings and satisfy him. The investigation of nature as a whole cannot yield any practical result of the first kind. Therefore all scientific search for ultimate truth is an implicit acknowledgment or search for an intellectual Companion. So reasons the

author, and correctly. The materialist might, however, carry out the analysis of the first alternative and claim that implicit in the search of nature in its totality is the practical interest, the hope that somehow the result of the discovery of ultimate truth will merely promote the ends of ordinary human welfare.

In like manner the author claims that our ideal of goodness must be traced ultimately to an absolute standard and that such a standard is to be found only in God.

The discussion of the problems of evil and of freedom is one of the most interesting in the book. That both problems are for man in his present circumstances insoluble is freely admitted. Both contain an irreconcilable contradiction. Moral evil as we know it introduces a factor into the theistic problem which cannot be fully overcome in our attempts to prove God's goodness. The existence of goodness, however, must also be accounted for and its presence in the world is at least an offset to that of evil, and must be referred to some source essentially good.

The idea of freedom contains a contradiction also. Indeterminate freedom, capacity for choice independently of the prevailing motive, robs the idea of freedom of its moral content. So also freedom as determined by the prevailing motive, which itself is determined by pre-existing circumstances, robs it of its moral content. The consciousness of freedom, however, as self-determination and its universal value in the social life of man, abundantly established by the author, warrants our acceptance of the fact of freedom regardless of the general facts of science in the physical sphere.

Mr. Mallock sets aside these contradictions arising out of the problems of evil and of freedom as follows: All our ultimate conceptions, scientific, religious, and philosophical contain contradictions. Mansel is cited to show this in the religious and Herbert Spencer in the scientific realm. The presence of contradiction, therefore in an ultimate conception is not to be taken as a badge of its

falsity but rather of its truth. Or more accurately expressed we are warranted in asserting that in order for a thing to be true in itself it must for us appear to contain a contradiction. The existence of evil therefore and of contradictory notions of freedom is no barrier to belief in God's goodness and in the reality of freedom.

From a literary standpoint the book is very attractive. It abounds in telling illustration and the style generally is most excellent. Much of the argument is quite convincing, although more is conceded at times than seems necessary, to unbelieving science . The book will prove valuable to many doubting minds and ought to have a very wide reading. E. Y. Mullins.

The Universal Elements of the Christian Religion.
By Charles Cuthbert Hall, D. D., LL. D. F. H. Revell Co., New York, Chicago, Toronto.

This volume consists of the Cole lectures for 1905 delivered before Vanderbilt University, at Nashville, Tenn. The lectures are announced as "an attempt to interpret contemporary religious conditions." Dr. Hall brings to his task breadth of view, sympathy with the best elements in the older as well as the newer types of thought, and a profound conviction of the importance and urgency of the missionary task of Western Christianity. Indeed the predominant note of these lectures is missionary. They are in very large part a discussion of the relations of the western forms of Christianity to the missionary problem in Asia. Dr. Hall has had exceptional opportunities for informing himself upon the missionary movement in the East, and for reaching matured conclusions as to conditions and difficulties there. He was a few years ago Barrows' lecturer in India and has published a volume of inspiring lectures on religious experience, as expounded to his Oriental audiences.

Dr. Barrows holds in general in the volume before us that the general theory of Western Christendom as to the missionary task in Asia is in part inadequate and at fault

in certain important respects. For example, he thinks that it is a mistake for us of the West to attempt to establish a religious protectorate over the East, and to seek to perpetuate the sectarian divisions of the West as the fixed and final form of Christianity. He holds rather that there are certain universal elements which constitute the essence of Christianity and that when these have been imparted through missionary labors to the eastern people, we should naturally look for a development of Oriental Christianity after its own kind. The West, Dr. Hall thinks, has failed to understand and appreciate the East, and that the spiritual history of the East, resulting in failure and disappointment, has prepared it in a very peculiar way for the acceptance of Christ and his salvation.

The "larger church" of Christ about which Dr. Hall writes does not receive exact definition. He thinks the time is not ripe for such definition, but holds that the current dissatisfaction with the strife and discord among Christian denominations is an evidence that the *status quo* of Protestantism cannot permanently satisfy. If it should be inferred from the foregoing very inadequate statement of Dr. Hall's position that he is an advocate of a Christianity watered down and weakened, or converted into a pale ethical shadow of the original, this would be a serious error. On the contrary Dr. Hall insists upon the cross and the resurrection of Jesus as the core and center of the Gospel, that his atonement and his glorified resurrection life were in primitive apostolic Christianity, and are to-day its very essence. He deprecates strongly the prevailing tendency to limit the authoritativeness and permanently valid element of the New Testament to the historic life of Jesus as recorded in the synoptic Gospels. He urges that the Gospel of John and the Pauline epistles are the correct interpretation of Christ and that these alone yield to us the complete Christ of the early Evangel, the saving Christ of succeeding centuries.

The reader whose interest in the progress of the king-

dom of God on earth is deep and earnest cannot fail to respond to the general spirit and purpose of this volume, *i. e.*, to its yearning for a more efficient missionary Christianity, and for a Christianity which shall be fully awake to its privilege and responsibility. Few will dissent from the view that the present divided state of western Christianity is not Christ's ideal. While there will be much difference of opinion as to what the "larger church" of Christ should be, yet few will be disposed to question the view that the missionary motive and impulse are a powerful means for the realization of Christ's will on all disputed points. Obedience to Christ in his redemptive purpose will solve a thousand problems. Men may come to see after all that that "larger church" exists already, and that what is needed is simply a making general of principles already in operation, not in the form of a Christian union under some dominating ecclesiastical center, but under the operation of the "universal elements" of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. E. Y. Mullins.

Faith and The Faith.

By Rev. T. T. Eaton, D. D., Ph. D. F. H. Revell Company, and Baptist Book Concern, Louisville, Ky. 78 pages.

This booklet of 78 pages seeks to accentuate the value and importance of faith and the necessity of "contending earnestly for the faith once delieverd to the saints." It is divided into two parts. Part I. deals with Faith and considerable space is devoted to the superiority of faith to doubt and to reason. The author thinks the verb *faithe* to correspond with the noun faith should be restored to current usage just as believe corresponds with the noun belief. The reviewer agrees with the author in this.

The author condemns doubt in every form. "Doubt always brings paralysis and death" (p. 18). To doubt the wisdom of a sinful life and to turn to righteousness does not mean that doubt has any value. Doubt is like letting go one round of the ladder while faith is grasping the next round and climbing upward. But doubt has no value,

even though it is the letting go the lower round. So reasons the author. This is, to say the least, a questionable conclusion.

The author does not attach much importance to reason as compared with faith. "The function of reason is negative; necessary to be sure but negative." "The one use of reason is to enable us to avoid making mistakes" (p. 24). "All real progress in human history rests, not on scientific investigation, philosophical inquiry and logical deduction, but on the heroes the workers and the martyrs, the men of faith" (p. 11).

Part II. is devoted to The Faith. The author tells us what he means by "the faith," viz: That it is the body of doctrine taught in the Scriptures centering in Christ and his work. In this division of the book the theological battle rages, and the champions on the respective sides shout their battle cries.

There are many strong points made. "It is high time Christians were obeying as they never obeyed before the great command to epi-agonize for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. This faith will not take care of itself. It needs for its maintenance, men and women who are willing to dare and do and die in its behalf. Maintaining it and extending it is our chief business in the world. The hopes of all mankind are centered here. Should this faith perish from the earth, the world would be wrapped in the shadows of a night that is starless. Whatever else fails this faith *must* conquer; whatever else falls, this faith *must* be upheld." pp. 76-77. The tonic of a strong conviction thus runs through many sentences. This conviction sometimes tends to a setting up of things in opposition which are not necssarily opposed. We emphatically dissent from the author's view as to the function of the reason where he declares that the function of reason is merely negative (pp. 24-25). One would think that this was merely an inadvertence if the author had not cited Kant and Huxley as authorities. The theory which he approvingly quotes from Kant is the fundamental

principle of the agnostic philosophy. Huxley, who is also approvingly cited, invented or adopted and made current, the word Agnosticism to describe the mental attitude which Kant expounded. In theology Ritschlianism is founded on the same theory of knowledge and the reason.

The author's praiseworthy desire to exalt faith did not need this theory of the reason to help it out.

E. Y. Mullins.

The Moral Dignity of Baptism.

By Rev. J. M. Frost, D. D. Sunday School Board Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. 1905.

No one who is at all familiar with current theological thought can doubt that we have come to a new epoch in the onward progress of denominationlism. It was the glory of the mighty Reformation movement that it brought the individual face to face with the Scriptures, with duty and with God. The many denominations which have arisen since were the result of the new conviction and fresh contact of the souls of men with divine truth and life. Denominational conviction for generations has expressed itself in controversy. The form of its assertion has been that of antithesis and antagonism to opposing creeds and confessions. So chronic has this habit become that in many minds there is a fear lest denominational conviction will perish utterly unless its expression is attended by a sharp polemic against these creeds. To such it does not seem to be conceivable that strong assertion, and vigorous faith are possible to one who abandons the attitude of the polemic for that of the truth-seeker simply and solely. But this is a grievous error. The truth is that the sharply polemical writer on denominational matters is, with thousands of people, discredited at the outset. He can of course strengthen the intensity of the polemic spirit in his own adherents, but he does not convince the outsiders whom he should most desire to reach. In other words he commits a most serious

strategical blunder. The hopeful sign of the times in this matter, however, is that discerning minds everywhere are perceiving that there is a better way. As a result a new denominational literature is coming into existence. This literature is not void of conviction. Ineed it throbs with it. But in it truth is stated on its merits and in its larger relations. It is not impoverished by being set forth merely as an opposing view to some particular form of view held by others.

Dr. Frost's book is an excellent example of the better method of dealing with doctrinal peculiarities of the denomination. The doctrine of baptism has been so bound up with polemics, that one rubs his eyes and looks again more closely as he peruses these pages and fails to find any note of bitterness. Here is strong conviction; here is a militant faith. But here also are love and tact. Here are respect and consideration for Christians whose views are opposed. Here are persuasion and argument and exposition, a setting forth of truth in its simplicity and beauty and *on its merits.* The place of baptism in its doctrinal bearings and relations is clearly set forth, and yet we have here a devotional book on baptism. The believer can read it with profit for the strengthening of the intellectual or the spiritual side of his nature.

The book has fourteen chapters and 282 pages. In chapter II. the "Moral Dignity of Baptism" is set forth. This appears in baptism in that it reproduces the august scene of the baptism of Jesus; is an image of the resurrection of Christ; along with the Bible, the Sabbath and the church baptism is a memorial witness for God; it symbolizes great heart experiences of the believer; it emphasizes the doctrine of the Trinity, and it is a prophecy of the resurrection of the bodies of believers. Chapter II. outlines the entire discussion of the book.

There are many things in this book which attract the reviewer's attention and are worthy of special mention. Our space will admit of a few only. Dr. Frost has set forth the evidential value of baptism, along with the

Bible, the Sabbath and the church with much force. Regarding these the author shows that they must be accounted for. They have a history of their own. There is no way in which their rise can be explained save in the Christian way. The ordinance of baptism points back in a convincing way to the great events of history with which it is associated. "These institutions which are here emphasized as monuments to a great event have a history of their own. Not only the event for which they stand but they themselves must be accounted for in the settlement of the question. They have each of them and inseparably, a history of nearly two thousand years. Where did they come from? And how came they with such charm and power? Manifestly they are here, and are traceable to that memorable morning, and to the event which made the day memorable forever; they are here after ceaseless and terrible conflict through the centuries —assailed, often marred, often broken and corrupted; but still here after many seeming failures, but by a succession of glorious triumphs; they are here accepted and accredited in their evidence after the severest testing by the most powerful appliances known to man; they are here as a large part of the world's life to-day, in great and growing power, much the same in form and spirit and purpose as when our Lord first ordained them and sent them on their mission to testify for him." (p.p. 106-107.)

In chapter X. there is an interesting discussion of "The Believer's Risen Life." Dr. Frost gives us in this chapter much needed emphasis upon a New Testament teaching which is too often neglected. The present life of the believer is a resurrection life. In *kind* it is the same life as that which he shall enjoy when his body is raised from the grave. The same divine power is now operating which will then culminate; baptism is the symbol of this resurrection life and should be so interpreted and understood. The doctrine of the resurrection in its spiritual bearings figures much more largely in New Testament

teachings than it does in current Christian teachings. Much in these chapters will tend to correct this deficiency. There are numerous details worthy of mention which we must pass over. Dr. Frost has placed us all under lasting obligations to him. He has broken ground in a new field on a very old subject in a most edifying way. Every pastor should have a copy of this book, and I know of no volume better suited to the young Christian. It is such a book as every convert sorely needs. It interprets for him all those vital and fundamental truths and experiences which enter into the earlier stages of the new life. He will find his heart burning within him as he reads these pages and follows the author in his exposition of the beautiful ordinance appointed by Christ in all its deep doctrinal significance and in its manifold relations. This volume will take its place in the library of our denominational literature as one of its most treasured volumes.

E. Y. Mullins.

Stones in the Rough, or Contributions Towards a Study of Theology Approached from the Heathen Side of the Fence.

By William Ashmore. Published by A. M. Skinner & Co., Boston.

Dr. William Ashmore is known by name among all who are informed concerning the last half century of Baptist foreign missions. In that time he came, through his distinguished labors in China, to hold front rank among the forces of Christian conquest. The vigor of his intellect, the stalwart orthodoxy of his faith, the successful skill of his labors gave him the reverent attention of any audience of hearers or readers. In his quiet years he is taking in hand to set forth, as the quotation on the cover tells us, "The gospel which I preach among the Gentiles," dedicating it "to the Executive Committee and Administrative Officers of the American Baptist Missionary Union, as illustrative of the Gospel they send out their missionaries to preach ———"

The work is in four parts, appearing separately, but to

be bound in a single volume of nearly 300 pages. Three parts are now in hand and one may speak confidently of the whole. The work is a combination of natural, systematic and Biblical theology. The style is clear and vigorous, the manner emphatic and frequently polemical, the spirit reverent and earnest. It affects to be "not for critical scholars, who like to discuss every philological feature of the text and every vicissitude which has attended its transmission from the earliest ages, but for common people whose complaint is soul hunger—who are tired of the everlasting doubts of the 'expert,' who want something to feed upon while crossing the desert, who continue to accept the old book just as it is—just as they had it from their fathers, who in turn had it from the apostles and the holy men of old—therefore the shaping of the discussion will be regulated accordingly." At least such is his attitude in Part III. and elsewhere it is similar. Yet he is unable to leave the "expert" and his vagaries alone, frequently attending to him in no uncertain, but in rather uncritical, style. Part I., about forty pages, deals with "the Method of Study and the Reason therefor." The fundamental religious questions are brought forward with a summary of the answers to them in the ethnic faiths, philosophy, science, etc. Part II., some seventy pages, deals with " the Theology of Nature" along lines largely familiar but with individuality and strength. His presentation of the "Gospel in Nature" is in the nature of a discovery and constitutes an original contribution to the subject. Some will find fault with the idea as being unorthodox, but they will do well to study it.

Part III. presents "the Theology of Revelation." Apparently this is to be "in sixteen lines of suggestion" of which only the first appears so far, viz.: "The Doctrine of These Scriptures concerning themselves," a discussion leaving somewhat to be desired. The other fifteen "lines of suggestion" cover all the topics of Biblical Theology.

Part IV. is to discuss "Related Subjects and Issues." The interest of the work will be found chiefly in the personality of the author, the presentation of the heathen temper and method of approach in the first parts and in the vigorous contention for the simple faith of the times when men prided themselves not on "critical scholarship," even though they were not wanting it. The orthodox faith is the proper furnishing for the missionary.

W. O. Carver.

History Unveiling Prophecy or Time as an Interpreter.

By H. Grattan Guinness, D. D., Fellow of the Astronomical Society. Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. XXI, 494. Cloth. $2.00 net.

Dr. Grattan Guinness has long been prominent as a student of prophecy and a leader in missions. Harley College, London, and the Region Beyond Mission are the monuments of his missionary activity; the result of his prophetical studies have been given to the world in a series of eight works of which this is the latest. He tells us (p. 393ff) how his interest on the subject began. It was on a visit to Spain in 1870. A new road, which was being cut through a small hill near Madrid, revealed a broad bank of ashes which had been covered for over a century. It proved to be the famous Tuemadero one of twelve places where martyrs were annually burned in Spain under the Inquisition. It was that day when standing breast deep in the ashes of Spanish martyrs that his attention was specially directed to the fulfillment of prophecy in papal history; and the fall of the Pope's temporal power a few months later led him to study and write on the subject. To Dr. Guinness Daniel and the Apocalypse are the very word of God. His principle of interpretation is *"God is His own Interpreter"* in two ways—by written words and acted deeds. So that Scripture is the key to Scripture and Providence to Prophecy. "The historic interpretation of the Apocalypse which rests on this two-fold foundation has been slowly developed under the influence of the divine action in

Providence; it has changed in details with the changing currents of Providence; it has grown with the growth of the knowledge of the plans of Providence; it has been confirmed and sealed by the whole course of Providence. It is no vain, or puerile, or presumptuous speculation. It is a reverent submission to the very Words of God, and a reverent recognition of His acts. God has spoken; He has given an explanation of the central and commanding vision of the prophecy; and God has acted; He has fulfilled its prediction. In pointing to the words and deeds of God we act as His witnesses. What hath God? What hath He done? These are the questions. We are wearied with vain speculations as to the meaning of prophecy which have no other formation than the assertions of men. We are wearied with speculations as to imaginary future fulfillments of prophecies which have been plainly accomplished before our eyes in the past; prophecies on whose accomplishment in the events of Christian history the structure of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century was built; on the fact of whose accomplishment in their days the confessors stood and the martyrs suffered."

Dr. Guinness follows the continuous historical scheme of interpretation and largely adopts the identification of Elliott's great work. Indeed he gives as sponsors of his general view a long and imposing array of great names from the second century down, including Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome and Augustine of the early centuries; Bede, Anselm, Wickliffe and Huss of the middle ages; the great body of Reformers and Puritan Theologians; and of Sir Isaac Newton, Joanthan Edward, Bengel and many others of later date. The interpretations of the Preterist he regards as "fanciful," those of the Futurists as "reveries," and those of many moderns, German and English, as "vague" and reducing the prophecy to "a nebulous mass of anticipations of things in general in human history."

According to our author the four empires of Daniel are Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome; the six seals represent in general the early triumphs of Christianity and the overthrow of the Pagan Roman Empire; the six Trumpets cover the overthrow of the Western Empire by the Goths, and of the Eastern by the Saracens and Turks; the rise of the Papacy and revival of the Roman Empire under Charlemagne, 800 A. D., answers to the prophecy of Rev. 13 being the restoration of the Roman Empire in its second or Gothic form under its revived eighth head; the Reformation explained the vision of the rainbow-crowned angel in Rev. 10; the papal reaction of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries explains the war against the sackcloth clothed witnesses of Rev. 11, whose death, resurrection and ascension finds fulfillment in English Revolution with its restoration to the Protestants of civil and religious freedom; the Seventh Trumpet heralds the Kingdom of Christ and as preparatory thereto ushers in the French Revolution and the vials of wrath outpoured upon the Papacy and Mohammedanism. Dr. Guinness feels that the seventh vial is yet to come and that it will mean the utter overthrow of Babylon the Great, *i. e.,* the Papacy.

This is all built on the year day theory. The author has brought to that view some additional support in Chiseaux's astronomical discoveries of the secular and cyclical character of the periods mentioned in prophecy, the 1260 years and 2300. Both are astronomic cycles harmonizing the lunar months with solar years, the latter being the only cycle, measured by complete centuries, possible within limits applicable to the cause of human history. The difference between the two, 1040 years, harmonizes days, months and years very exactly. The 1260 solar years represent the length of Papal temporal power from the decree of Phocas, 607 A. D., to 1867-70 A. D. The same number of years, lunar or solar, represent the treading down of the Holy City by Mohammedanism, the prophesying of the sackcloth clothed witnesses,

etc., while the "seven times," or 2520 solar years, span the whole period of the four empires beginning with Nabonassar of Babylon, 747 B. C., to the beginning of the French Revolution. In confirmation of the correctness of this theory he adduces a number of remarkable forereadings of important events such as those of the Bishop of Wocestter (p. 170), Gill (191), Sir Isaac Newton (197) and others.

This will be sufficient to indicate the author's view. We need only add that a spirit of sobriety pervades the volume; that Dr. Guinness is careful not to be too dogmatic about the future, abiding thus by his main thesis that history unveils prophecy; and that the book is pervaded by a gracious spirit and sometimes rises into passages of impassioned eloquence. We are bound to express also sympathy with the main position of the treatise. It seems to us most likely that in the Apocalpse we have a forecast of the fortunes of the cause of Christ in the world as i. 19 and iv. i., imply, that throughout the centuries it has served to cheer Christ's faithful ones with the assurance of final victory, and that it is reasonable to expect some measure of identification of the outstanding features of the centuries. If that be so it is quite unreasonable to think that the tremendous figure of the Papacy should be unnoticed. The facts of this book show a remarkable correspondence, to say the least, between its features and duration and those of the apocalyptic Babylon.

There are Old Testament prophecies which found fulfillment in Bible times; is it unreasonable to believe that some of the New Testament prophecies have been fulfilled within the past nineteen centuries? In view of all the facts the view of Dr. Guinness is immensely saner than that which practically denies the fact of predictive prophecy alogether or reduces it to the shrewd guess of some sagacious man. J. H. Farmer.

IV. NEW TESTAMENT.

The Messianic Hope in the New Testament.

By Shailer Mathews of the Department of Systematic Theology. The Decennial Publications, Second Series Vol. XII. The University of Chicago Press. 1905. Pp. XX, 338. Price $2.50 net.

This is a comprehensive survey and application of the Jewish Messianic hope under four historical divisions: "Part I. The Messianism of Judaism," "Part II. The Messianism of Jesus," "Part III. The Messianism of the Apostles," "Part IV. Christian Messianism and the Christian Religion." Dr. Mathews shows a thorough acquaintance with the authorities and sources of his subject and an extensive measure of independent skill in the statement and application of the principles of interpretation and construction by which he determines the conduct and conclusions of his discussion.

The nature of the Jewish Messianic hope is fully discussed by the historical method, under its two aspects of "The Politico-Social Program of Revolutionary Messianism," and "Apocalyptic Messianism," and it is concluded that the latter became the dominant form, and determinant in the forms of thought and expression for the religion of Jesus, both in himself and in his followers. There are found "seven Messianic elements common to the apocalyptic literature," viz.:

1. Two ages, "this age" and "the coming age."
2. The present age is evil and under control of Satan.
3. The coming age will be God's product by some catastrophic method.
4. The judgment in connection with this catastrophe is to be final and will punish the enemies of the Jews.
5. The new age to be characterized by the Kingdom of God, not produced but "given," and a Jewish Kingdom.
6. Resurrection of the righteous.
7. The personal Messiah, either "anointed" for his work, or superhuman.

The Messianism of Jesus and of the Apostles is tested by these seven elements. Jesus is found to hold six of the elements, differing only in the fifth point above. Jesus "distinctly repudiated" "the restriction of membership in the coming Kingdom to Jews." Jesus likewise controverted the characteristic elements of that pharisaic system that was built upon their Messianism. But with Jesus, as with Jews and Christians alike, the Kingdom of Heaven belongs to the future age. He is not, in his ministry, doing properly Messianic work, receiving the Messianic promises, or undergoing the Messianic experiences. He is preparing for all this and so must come again. He and his followers rested their hopes in the speedy coming of the really Messianic age. "Even though it should be shown that such an expectation was historically to be disappointed, the greatness of the personality which compelled itself to forecast its future in such ultimate conceptions is indisputable." Similarly "Primitive Christianity" is found to "reproduce pharisaic Messianism" and Paul, while contributing more of modification than his Christian predecessors, is still only casting in Christian modifications the pharisaic hope. In the "post-Pauline Christianity" we find the beginnings of a new form of conceiving the faith, stating its essentials in terms of Greek metaphysic, etc.

Early Christian history corroborates the results obtained from the previous study. The Christian church is a "Messianic fraternity" " in an evil age." In this Messianic conception the ethical teaching as to the family finds its positive content and its limitations, even its errors, which grow out of its temporary character.

Similarly the economic and political bearings of the new religion are seen from the apocalyptic standpoint and no effort is made to enter Christian principles as vital forces for the reconstruction and renovation of the social organism or organizations. The teaching of Jesus, the practice of the early church, the apostolic teaching all seek to rescue from society the elect and hold them aloof

till God shall "give" the new age with its Messiah in his kingdom.

The object of the book is to constitute a contribution to theological reconstruction. This is forecasted in the first sentence of the *Introduction* and announced in the beginning of the concluding *summary* where the results of "our investigation" are "summarized with a view to their use in constructive processes which lie outside our present purpose" but which a footnote bids us expect in the author's "forthcoming book, *The Gospel and the Modern Man.*" Such reconstruction must depend "not only upon strictly philological exegesis, but also upon that larger historical exegetical process that endeavors to separate the content of a correctly apprehended teaching from the historical form in which it is cast," for "it is in the content of biblical teaching alone that men of to-day can feel more than an antiquarian interest." So far from approving the apostolic injunction to "hold fast the form of sound words," Dr. Mathews finds the form a real hindrance to the freedom of the truth, though he would hardly agree that this injunction is apostolic. This fundamental principle he applies with vigor. To illustrate, in considering the Messianism of Jesus we must deal with three questions. First it is necessary to ascertain what that teaching is; then we must analyze "the content of the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus;" lastly, we must ascertain what elements in the words and thoughts of Jesus are essential. "The question as to what is true, and what is false in his teaching"—there is such a question of which the "reverent critic" is the judge—"is not to be confused with the question as to what is inherited and what is original in his thought." The Messianism of his times is "the interpretative medium through which we must study him;" but not all such heritage is to be rejected at once as false. "Much of what he inherited was rejected by him," and more of it "will be rejected by men in different intellectual conditions." "The practical problem for to-day lies just

here. After a study of Messianism enables us to understand Jesus better, there is still left the question as to what in his teaching is eternally true." We need pursue his application of this method further only to say that his conclusion as to the incarnation seems to be that the strictly Jewish conception of it was quite other than would properly employ our term *incarnation* and that Jesus did not likely so conceive himself. "He regarded himself as the Christ—the Anointed of God—because he was conscious of God in his personality. What 'unction' was in Semitic thought, incarnation was in Greek thought." The Jew might argue from his death that Jesus was the Christ; but "for the man who does not care to reach that particular conclusion it [his death] stands equally significant as a fact in the history of the race, a testimony to the suprehuman personality of the historical Jesus. It matters not in what schematic relation it is placed, etc."

What is the principle which is to guide in all this work of separating eternal truth from the forms of conceiving it as recorded in our Bible? The author's answer is *Messianism,* pharisaic, apocalyptic Messianism; and he stretches this term to cover all relating of one's present life and hopes to the future. By such an accommodation of the term the author is able to find his principle everywhere. Paul's doctrine of justification grows directly out of it and means only acquital at a future judgment. It is hardly too much to say that Paul would never be able to recognize his system under this author's presentation and that he would be utterly surprised to know that he was so dominated by the Messianism of the Pharisees in his religious and theological thought and teaching. It would be equally surprising to the first cenury Christians to be told how very limited was their outlook, how mistaken their hopes and how crude their idea of their mission in the world.

Naturally such a study as this cannot proceed without critical examination of the literary sources. Such critic-

ism is little applied to the apocryphal literature. Here it is difficult to be sure of conclusions but Dr. Mathews seems to locate rather more of it in the first century B. C. than would be generally so admitted. He follows the usual views of the "critical school" as to the New Testament writings, though with a large measure of freedom and independence, an independence which loses something of admiration from the fact that it not rarely seems to be in the service of the thesis of the present work. We find here the usual vices of that subjective criticism which in the want of any scientific canons must be a law unto itself. We even find that *derniere resort* of the "critic," the "gloss." Peter's confession of Jesus as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Mt. 16:16) "is clearly an addition of the evangelist." "Clearly" on what grounds? There is need of recognizing that "scholarship" is not the only substantive that may follow the epithet "critical." Criticism is not inseparable from scholarship. There is also a dogmatism of scholarship before which we all tremble. Our author sometimes seems to the reviewer to go out of his way to acknowledge the tyranny of the critical scholasticism of our day. When he reaches "traditional" conclusions, as he does by vigorous reasoning, at many points, he inserts in the text or a note some word to vindicate himself from the suspicion of accepting too much of the text as original or any of it as authoritative. His attitude toward John's Gospel is far more conservative than is popular among the scholars of the day and the author's tone is distinctly confessional in announcing his views and in making such full use of it.

The work is the result of profound research, elaborate thought and keen analysis. It will give any reader new views and heightened interest in the essentials of the faith of the Son of God. W. O. Carver.

The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers.

By a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. 1905.

This is an admirable piece of work and will be found

of real service by the student who wishes to know exactly what use the Apostolic Fathers made of the New Testament. It is carefully done and a bit sceptical at times, but certainly not credulous. It is exhaustive and gives one all the criteria. Prof. Bartlet is slow to admit that Barnabas made use of Matt. 22:14. The work is done by Profs. Bartlet, Lake, Carlyle, Inge, Benecke, and Drummond. A. T. Robertson.

Grammar of New Testament Greek.

By Friedrich Blass, Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Halle—Wittenburg. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray, M. A. Second revised and enlarged edition. London, England and New York, Macmillan & Co. 1905. Pages 372.

The translation is well done and the work serves well those who do not wish so bulky a volume as Winer. The discussions are very brief and the examples very numerous. Dr. Blass is one of the foremost of living Greek scholars and his opinions deserve consideration. One cannot agree to all his positions on New Testament points. But it is a careful piece of work. It is time for more work to be done in the field of New Testament grammar. Winer no longer meets the modern requirements and Schmiedel's revision does not. The Prolegomena of Moulton's New Grammar is just out and will be reviewed in the next issue. Progress is being made in this sicence.

A. T. Robertson.

Four Portraits of the Lord Jesus Christ.

By George Soltan. New York, Charles C. Cook, 150 Nassau St. 1905.

This is not an unsuccessful effort to set forth the characteristics of the Four Gospels. The author conceives that in Mark Jesus is set forth as the Servant in Matthew as the King, in Luke as the Man, in John as the Son of God. The book is popular with some catchy elements, but will be found useful to some classes of readers. There is an introduction by Dr. C. I. Scofield.

A. T. Robertson.

The Childhood of Jesus Christ.

By Henry Vun Dyke, D. D. New York, Frederick Stokes & Co. 1906. Pages 120.

This is one of the daintiest little books of the last season. Dr. Van Dyke takes twenty of the great pictures by famous artists and talks delightfully about them. Murillo, Holman Hunt, Velasquez, Raphael, Burne-Jones, Botticelli, and others have done some of their best work on the Childhood of Jesus. This is a choice book for mother and child to read together. The Sunday school teachers would find it very appropriate this year.

A. T. Robertson.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Holy Spirit.

By Louis Burton Crane, A. M. American Tract Society, New York· 1905. Price 75 cents.

This is the sixth volume in the series of the volumes on The Teachings of Jesus issued by the Tract Society and edited by the Secretary, Dr. John H. Kerr. Prof. Crane has written on this very important theme with judgment, ability, and reverence. It is distinctly didactic, but is highly devotional also. The book in admirable fashion seizes the point of view of Jesus and gives expression to the mission of Christ for his people and the world through the teaching of the Holy Spirit. This is the best and most helpful brief discussion of the Holy Spirit that one can get. It ought to stimulate many a life to nobler service. Prof. Crane is a thorough scholar in his methods of work. A. T. Robertson.

The Young People's Imitation of Christ. Based upon the work of Thomas A. Kempis.

By Edward S. Ellis. Philadelphia. The Rowland & Griffith Press.

This is a little book to lay on the table of a young boy or girl that he or she may often pick it up. Wherever it may be opened there is something to catch the eye, which is so tersely put that it sticks in the mind. Placing the

lofty teachings of Thomas à Kempis in condensed form is a distinct favor in this busy twentieth century.

I. M. M.

Paulus der Mensch und sein Werk: Die Anfänge des Christentums, der Kirche und des Dogmas.

Von Heinrich Weinel. Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, Germany. 1904. S. 316. To be had also of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

This is not a life of Paul nor a discussion of the critical questions of chronology and authorship. In a "nachwort" the author does express disbelief in the genuineness of 2 Thess., Eph., and the Pastoral Epistles. But he is not so extreme as Schmiedel, Pfleiderer, or Wernle. He is rather a disciple of Weizsäcker. The aim of Weinel is rather to discuss the problems of Paul's character and the fundamental problems of Christianity in the hands of this "second Founder" of Christianity. He insists that the modern historian cannot understand Paul apart from his time. This analysis of Paul's career is very stimulating. He treats him as The Pharisee, The Seeker after God, The Prophet, The Apostle, The Founder of the Church, The Theologian, The Man. It is a vivid and largely a true picture that Weinel draws of the great Apostle. It is defective at points, but the writer evidently writes *con amore* and so with power. There is a fresh run of books on Paul and this is one of the ablest and most suggestive. Dr. Sanday says that the next great debate will be on the relation between Paul's teaching to that of Jesus.

A. T. Robertson.

L'Apotre Paul et Je'sus Christ.

Par Maurice Goguel. Librairie Fischbacher, 33 Rue de Seine, Paris France. To be had also of Lemcke & Buechner, New York.

The author is right in saying that this is a somewhat neglected field, though Feine's Jesus Christus and Paulus (1902) and numerous magazine articles we have. Dr. R. J. Knowling has just written The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ. There are besides the works of Bruce and

Somerville on the Christology of Paul. M. Goguel takes only 1 Thess., Gal., 1 and 2 Col., Rom., Philemon and Phil. as genuine Pauline Epistles. He rejects the Gospel of John. He thus has a much narrower range from which to draw his material. Nor can one agree at all points with his ideas of Paul and Christ. He denies, for instance, that Jesus gave the Great Commission, and yet makes Paul attach a sacramental and saving efficacy to baptism. However, there is much that is helpful in M. Goguel's volume. He has in large measure covered fresh territory.

A. T. Robertson.

V. SOCIOLOGY.

General Sociology: an Exposition of the Main Development in Sociological Theory from Spencer to Ratzenhofer.

By Albion W. Small, Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology in the University of Chicago. Pp. 739. The University of Chicago Press. 1905.

This is a notable contribution to the study of Sociology, perhaps the most notable that has recently appeared. The book is large, well printed and in general sufficiently impressive in form. Its literary quality, however, is seriously open to criticism. It is hard to read, often unnecessarily difficult in phraseology, not always luminous in arrangement, and sometimes unpolished, not to say inexcusably careless in style. The treatment, as the author frankly avows in the preface, is not uniform or proportionate; some topics are needlessly expanded, others merely mentioned. There is much repetition, and sometimes separate discussion of matters that might as well have been treated together. Occasionally one wonders that the analysis is not more clear and condensed, strings of related topics being tied together by association instead of logically grouped under briefer general categories. But these defects are of form rather than in matter, and some are mere things of taste where no two readers would perhaps agree, and the author has

certainly a right to tell his thoughts in his own way. Still one could but wish that so useful and thoughtful a book might have been made more attractive to readers in general, and thus have enhanced its usefulness. Others than specialists would be greatly profited by studying the volume, but they will not find it easy reading! But those who are attracted by the subject and are willing to think will certainly find it both interesting and profitable reading; for a great book it undoubtedly is.

In the preface the author modestly calls his work a "conspectus," and a "syllabus," rather than a treatise. It is the "outline" of his lecture course in the University of Chicago, some topics not being fully treated in the book. The work also represents in a general way the point of view held by the department of Sociology of which the author is the head professor. The purpose of the book is thus briefly stated: "The main objects of this syllabus are, first, to make visible different elements that must necessarily find their place in ultimate sociological theory; and, second, to serve as an index to relations between the parts and the whole of sociological science." In other words: "It is an attempt both to give the layman a general idea of the ground covered by sociological theory, and to orient the student who wishes to prepare himself for independent sociological research." The purpose is still further explained to be that of pointing out the connection and correlation of all the special social sciences, to include all points of view under the broadest possible survey of the "social process" as a whole. It seeks to "show how far the sociologists have gone toward establishing a point of view that will reveal the actual world in which men have their life-problems." Thus the high aim of the work is both scientific and practical.

The work is presented in nine parts, as follows: (1) The Introduction, which discusses the subject-matter, definitions, impulse, history, and problems of Sociology; (2) Society considered as a whole composed of definitely arranged parts (structure)—an interpretation of

Spencer; (3) Society considered as a whole composed of parts working together to achieve results (function)—an interprtetation of Schäffle; (4) Society considered as a process of adjustment by conflict between associated individuals—an interpretation of Ratzenhofer; (5) Society considered as a process of adjustment by co-operation between associated individuals—further interpretation of Ratzenhofer; (6) Conspectus of concepts derived by analysis of the social process; (7) The social process considered as a system of psychical problems; (8) The social process considered as a system of ethical problems; (9) The social process considered as a system of technical problems. Such is the author's own outline—our review will follow it.

In the Introduction (Part I.) the leading clue of the whole discussion is put into our hands in the opening statement that "the subject-matter of sociology is the *process* of human association." Further on we meet with the phrase "a science of men in their associational processes." Still further we find the statements: "Wherever there are human beings there are phenomena of association. Those phenomena constitute a process composed of processes. There can be no convincing science of human life till these processes are known, from least to greatest, in the relation of each to each and to all. Knowledge of human life which stops short of this is at best a fragment, and at worst a fiction." The aim of the sociologist is therefore to gain as complete a view as possible of this "social process" considered as a whole. Accordingly we shall not find it difficult to agree with the author when he admits that "sociology thus defined is, and must remain, more a determining point of view than a finished body of knowledge." After insisting in various ways that the special sciences are partial apprehensions and must be contributory to the larger view of sociology, and after giving and discussing several definitions the author sums up his whole contention in the concise definition that "sociology is the science of the social process."

The "impulse of sociology" next receives brief attention, and the author thinks it came rather from philanthropy than from science. Next he gives a brief sketch of the "history of sociology," mentioning with more or less criticism the leading writers, such as Montesquieu, Comte, De Greef, Spencer, Schaeffle, Ward, Giddings, and some others. Finally in this part the problems of sociology are briefly pointed out. The main problem, as it appears to the author from his point of view of the whole "social process," is to discover and combine under one general working concept all the phases of this "process." Or, to use his own language: "Regarding human experience as a whole, how may we mentally resolve it into its factors, and at the same time keep effectively in view the vital interaction of the factors in the one process?"

The next four Parts (II.-V.) deal with the systems of sociological thought represented respectively by Herbert Spencer, Schäffle and Ratzenhofer. It seems to this reviewer that this portion of the work might with great advantage have been condensed and simplified; the exposition is a little tedious and sometimes confusing. At the same time the criticism of Spencer and Schaeffle is penetrating and judicious, and the setting forth of Ratzenhofer's scheme and its adoption in the main give indication of its influence on the author's own thinking. In fact it is not easy to see always whether your teacher is the German author or his American interpreter. In brief Spencer's scheme is unfolded as representing society as a great static organism; his over-emphasis on the "biological analogy" is properly judged and rejected; and the inadequacy of his system as a whole, because confined too much to a study of social "structure" as evolved and static, is clearly shown. Schäffle marks a distinct advance on Spencer, for while holding also to the "biological analogy"—that society is to be regarded as a vast living body or organic whole—he looks at it from the point of view of "function" rather than of structure; considers the part played by the various elements in social

progress. This too is inadequate; society is more and other than a great living organism with its bodily "structures" or "functions." Yet this "biological" conception of the social life of men served to bring out some very important elements of the whole truth; and the reality which underlay the overworked illustration must continue to underlie all attempts to express it in terms.

As already intimated the "interpretation of Ratzenhofer" itself needs interpreting; for the author mingles his own views and those of other sociologists with those of the philosopher whom he is "interpreting" to such a degree that what is distinctive in the scheme is hard to discover. But so far as appears the general outlines of Ratzenhofer's system are: (1) That society is to be regarded as a "process rather than a state; (2) that the garded as a "process" rather than a state; (2) that the forces in carrying on this process; (3) that the conflict of these interests is both rudimentary and perpetual as a factor in the social process; (4) but the harmony and co-operation ("socialization") of these interests is both a present force and a final cause in molding and directing the social process. Evidently the system is composite and highly developed, but Ratzenhofer's individual work seems to be that of emphasis, grouping and co-ordination rather than of discovery. At any rate on this general basis—no matter whence derived—the discussion of the book as a whole proceeds. Along with the unfolding of Ratzenhofer's ideas Dr. Small has presented his own analysis of the "social process," and this is now to be considered.

In chapter XIV. (still in Part V.) our author states the "elements of the social process." These are "interests," or "something in men that makes them have wants, and something outside of men that promises to gratify the wants." "The primary interest of every man, as of every animal, is in sheer keeping alive. Nobody knows how many ages men consumed in getting aware of any other interest. This primary animal interest can never be out-

grown, although it is doubtful if we ever observe it alone in normal human beings." Forms of this primary interest have regard to food, sex and work. "The three species of interest which I call food, sex and work make up one genus of human interests to which I give the name the health interest. By this phrase I mean all the human desires that have their center in exercise and enjoyment of the powers of the body." On this basis and in combination with these bodily wants are five other sets of interests and under the six all the activities of men in the social process may be grouped. These are: Health, Wealth, Sociability, Knowledge, Beauty, Rightness. "Men have a distinct interest in controlling the resources of nature, in asserting their individuality among their fellows, in mastering all that can be known, in contemplating what seems to them beautiful, and in realizing what seems to them right." It is (to fall back on Ratzenhofer's phrases) the conflict and the co-operation of these interests that constitute the social process. This analysis of interests is fundamental to the author's thinking in all the rest of the book, and no one can deny him the right to choose both his categories and his terms. Not all would accept them as final or complete, and the author himself intimates as much; but they are convenient guides under which to follow out many aspects of a study of the social process.

In Part VI. a different method of study is pursued, and there is much repetition of ideas brought out in the preceding discussion. This part presents a list of concepts derived from the previous analysis. The list would be open to serious criticism on several grounds—as being ill-arranged, overlapping, disproportionately studied, and other objections. The conspectus, as given in chapter XXIX., contains fifty-one topics; and the last two being subdivided there are in all more than eighty "concepts" strung out in formidable array. With some abbreviations, but no omissions, this is the list: The conditions of society, the elements of society, society, the

physical environment, interests, the individual, the spiritual environment, contacts, differentiation, group, form of the group, conflict, social situations, association, the social, the social process, nature of the social process, content of the social process, stages of the social process; social evolution, structure, function, forces, ends or purposes; subjective environment; social consciousness, ascendency, control, order, status, unity; corporation, constitution of the corporation, social mechanism, social authority, the social organism; social institutions, relationships, reactions, adjustment, assimilation; integration, individualization, socialization, genesis, genetic structures, social institutions (again), telesis, stimulus and response, the effective interests, struggle or conflict of interests, co-operation or conjunction of interests, moralization, culture, barbarism, civilization, equalization, restraint, means to equilibrium (of the last two); social production, consumption, achievement; partnership of the individual in social achievement, capitalization of social development, stages in the development of civilization, social progress, the dynamic agency of institutions, the State, political principles, property, the sociological point of view, pure sociology, applied sociology, descriptive sociology, expository sociology, normative sociology, technological sociology, sociological problems, social problems. In looking over a list of terms like this one's first exclamation is a paraphrase of a Shakespearean saying: If this be method there is madness in it! But on reading the sane and sensible, often profound and practical, discussion of many of these "concepts" which follows in the remainder of the book, one is disposed to forgive the author for his confusing outline. For there is more of distinction in the topics than appears in the bare statement of them. Some are not discussed at all; some are briefly noticed; and some are treated at considerable length. Nor is the scheme strictly adhered to as proposed. At the close of the discussion (p. 615) the author says: "The terms in our schedule are merely tentative formulations

of social facts which it is the task of sociology to make more exact. . . . The generalizations which we have brought together are not scheduled as a closed system of social science. They are statements of apparent and approximate truths, in the region of which earnest efforts to develope tenable sociology are in progress."

In Part VII. the great topic of the relation of Sociology to Psychology is presented. The discussion is all too brief, but is sound, balanced and suggestive. The discussion opens with an admirable summary (p. 619f.)—too long to quote—of the whole preceding treatment, and a statement of how that brings the student into the field of psychology. Description must precede explanation, but having collected the social data we must seek their explanation. This is social psychology. For "the promising attempts to interpret the social process are all based on the assumption that interchange of psychical influences is somehow the decisive fact in human association. . . All the physical and biological conditions to which men are subject are taken for granted at their full value; but the variant that at last separates human association from the associations of other animals, and which is trusted to account for the peculiar features of the human process, is the influence of mind upon mind." For which wise words many students, long disgusted with materialistic and biological assumptions of finality, will be profoundly grateful. In discussing elements of social causation our author is no less sane and broad. He disposes of Tarde's attempt to found the whole social process in the single law of imitation in a short but telling criticism. He sums up the matter by saying that Tarde's mistake "in locating the essential social factor in a single form of mental action, instead of in some total assertion of personality, is sufficiently conspicuous to serve as a perpetual injunction upon similar ventures. There is no visible sanction for the hope that a clue to the social process will ever be found in a simple mental reaction." This dictum applies to Giddings' theory (which our author criticises else-

where) of "consciousness of kind;" and, *mutatis mutandis,* to Ward's materialistic theory of molecular aggregation. Again, on p. 639 our author says: "The sociologists have done their part to show that the most significant factors of life are the work of mind, not the grinding of machinery." (And here we must remember that Ward has, in spite of his earlier materialistic assumptions, taken a considerable share). Our author concludes that the real task of social psychology is to state the social process in terms of purpose. The will of man, guided by his feelings and his reason, is the dominant factor in association.

Part VIII. deals with the relation of Sociology to Ethics. The author notes the current confusion of ethical standards, criticises the utilitarian and evolutionary theories as one sided and inadequate, and tries to show that the sociological conception of the whole of human life as a process offers the only hope of developing an ethical theory and standard that will ultimately command general assent. This part of the book is not satisfactory. The author does not seem even to suggest the theistic and intuitional basis of morals, but leaves himself in the air with his "social process" theory. Thus on p. 656f he says: "The next step for our intelligence to take is recognition that these practical judgments of conduct within the actual life-process are the raw material of the only ethics that promises to gain general assent." But as this "process" is not necessarily "moral" wherein does this theory essentially differ from the evolutionary view, except in that it is assumed to have a wider basis and a fuller content? Is not the principle the same? Further, the author's sociological theory has also a trend in the direction of utilitarianism, for it holds that that is good which upon the whole best promotes the life-process. This squints towards the "greatest happiness of the greatest number" notion. While the sociological theory in terms repudiates the evolutionary and utilitarian hypotheses as too narrow it does in some measure pre-

serve whatever is true and best in those partial conceptions, and it does present a better standard by virtue of this larger outlook upon life as a whole; but it is only a degree above them at last, and is as far removed from finality as they were. Any ethical theory which leaves out of account the nature, character and will of God, as somehow revealed to the consciousness and conscience of man, is bound to be incomplete because essentially unsound.

Part IX. briefly considers some of the technical problems of sociology. The main practical problem is how to adjust means to ends in securing the bettter advancement of the whole social process. In chapter L. we have a "conspectus of the social situation as given in the present state of achievement and in unsolved technical problems." The grand divisions are suggested by the six groups of interests to which Dr. Small holds: Achievement in promoting health, in producing wealth, in harmonizing human relations, in discovery and spread of knowledge, in the fine arts, and in religion. The enumeration under these general heads is exhaustive and able, and presents a capital outline for advanced sociological study.

The defects of the book, as they appear to the reviewer, have been in general and in some details indicated in the preceding account. It remains to summarize some of its merits. Comprehensiveness of range and depth of thought characterize the work in marked degree. On many details where discussion is waived or brief there is evidence of much and profound reflection. Though the author is a well-informed student of many other men, he is a *critical* student. There is sanity and balance of judgment which correctly appraises what is valuable in the work of others and fairly states the author's own conclusions. The absence of dogmatism and sensationalism is a delightful note of both power and rationality in the study. And the book, notwithstanding its depth and its difficulty, is nothing if not practical. It is far from being a mere academic discussion, or speculation on unrealities.

It seeks to come to the heart of "the social process" in order to promote social well-being and well-doing. It is a pleasure to recognize a great achievement and congratulate the author upon his success. E. C. Dargan.

The Negro in the Cities of the North.

Reprinted from Charities Vol. XV, No. 1, Oct. 7, 1905 by the Charities Publication Committee, New York. 96 pp.

Perhaps the wicked and sordid agitation of questions concerning the negro by Thomas Dixon and some of his equally unsober critics may serve the end of arousing a more general, humane and Christian interest in the negro that by the application of sound principles and adequate information will make some noteworthy advance in dealing with a complicated and delicate condition.

The October 7 number of "Charities and the Commons"—weekly, $2.00 per year—brought together a remarkable collection of articles dealing with all phases of the question of the negro in Northern cities. The writers are white and black and represent all phases of interest in the negro where that interest is sympathetic and constructive. There are some two dozen writers and a brief note with each name tells his relation to the work in hand. The illustrations are numerous, admirable, informing. The articles bring together extensive and most valuable information and constitute one of the indispensable helps for studying the various negro questions.

One does not yet see daylight on this dark problem. That the solution lies along the way of education is clear enough. Just what is to be the nature of that education is more uncertain. So far there are utterly "diverse programs for the education and advancement of the negro with his conflicting ideals" and there is yet a third idea which can hardly be called an ideal and which has no program but many adherents and which is taken little account of by the students of this subject. There is, moreover, one phase of the whole question of which no recognition has come to the notice of this writer: The vast

majority of notable examples of negro education and leadership are of mixed blood and leave the serious question of the native negro capacity unanswered. That many negroes are capable of the highest and best need not be discussed, but are they all or any great number of them capable? One hopes so, but has seen no sufficient evidence as yet. Little account seems to be taken of tribal differences in American negroes, so signficant in Africa.

The discussions of this volume call for careful study by every friend of the negro. W. O. Carver.

Social Theories and Social Facts.

By William Morton Grinnell. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1905. Pp. 146.

It is hard to get for the group of subjects discussed in this little book a title that would not be more or less misleading, but there is scarcely excuse for taking one quite so wide of the mark as this. Instead of a treatise on Sociology the author discusses corporations, trusts, competition, cost of living, wages, railway rates, public ownership of utilities, and related topics. In general the argument lies against the popular condemnation of trusts and the popular demand for public ownership of utilities. The author maintains that trusts are a natural development of the laws of trade and that legislation against them is ill-advised. There ought to be enforcement of the laws against individual offenders. He exposes the evils of competition, and maintains that the Standard Oil Trust is a fine flower of the method of competition. The tendency of capitalistic combination has been to increase wealth per capita, and there is now more general distribution of wealth than ever before. For while the management of the great corporations is in fewer hands, their shares are more widely distributed than formerly. In 1880 the Pennsylvania Railroad had less than 14,000 shareholders, while it now has 44,000. He pays his respects to the "municipal ownership" theory in regard to public utilities, and insists that a time when great political

corruption is known to exist is certainly not a favorable one in which to experiment with so great an enlargement of political function. The author has a word to say against labor unions and the strikes promoted by them. He declares for the individual rights of workmen as against the tyrannies of unionism.

Finally the author has a good word for the much maligned railroads, showing how they have developed the country and what friends they have been to labor, and so on. He says that the American railroads in 1904 paid out forty-one per cent. of their gross receipts to labor and twenty-five per cent. to capital, while the English roads paid forty per cent. to capital and twenty-eight to labor.

On the whole the book presents, without bitterness, a pretty strong plea for the capitalistic side of current economic questions. E. C. Dargan.

VI. SERMONS.

The Song of Ages. Sermons.

By Reginald J. Campbell. Minister of the City Temple, London. Published by A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

Mr. Campbell is the successor of Dr. Joseph Parker, at the City Temple, London. There is nothing in the book to indicate whether this is the first or second or third volume of sermons by Mr. Campbell. There are seventeen sermons in this volume. Some of them have striking subjects, e. g. "The Unrecognized Christ." John 1:33, "Where Jesus Failed." Matt. 13:58, "The Death of the Soul" Ezek. 18:4, "Hell's Vision of Heaven" Luke 16:23.

What are the impressions on the mind after the reading? It is well to remember that a sermon does not mean the same thing to all hearers. Another might read this volume and lay it down with impressions quite different from mine. It is our duty to hear the preacher with sympathy. He is endeavoring to help us. He cannot do this unless we open our hearts to his message. And he is

speaking in the name of God. These two things should make us gentle critics.

Mr. Campbell impresses me as a sincere man, simple and fearless in his preaching. His sermons show that he is a student of the Word and that he has a pretty fair acquaintance with men. He endeavors to answer the questions of the soul. I do not agree with all his expositions of Scripture nor do all his answers to the questions of the soul satisfy me. Judging from the spirit of the sermons, I imagine that he would not quarrel with me on account of my dissent.

The language of the preacher is simple. He has in every sermon something for the unsaved. And yet every sermon seems to me unfinished, that is, the preacher should have pressed the truth further. It seems to me that he does not drive the nail quite home, and of course does not clinch it. I felt this especially after reading "The Death of the Soul" and "Hell's Vision of Heaven." It seems to me also that he makes unnecessary concessions to the critical spirit of our time.

It was my privilege in 1879-80 to hear Mr. Campbell's predecessor, Dr. Parker, several times. The atmosphere of the City Temple was very different from that of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Mr. Spurgeon's Church. An intelligent business man, a Londoner, spoke of the two preachers in this way: "I hear Dr. Parker nearly every Sunday. He is a pleasing speaker. He rarely says disagreeable things. I always come away from the City Temple thinking well of myself. It never occurs to me that he means *me*. But Spurgeon stirs me up. I feel that he is always addressing me. And he makes me dissatisfied with myself. I come away from the Tabernacle a wretched sinner, and I have to go to the City Temple several times before I regain my equilibrium. I go to the Tabernacle two or three times a year. Mr. Spurgeon is a good man and an earnest preacher. I admire him. But if I were to hear him every Sunday I should have to change my way of living."

These sermons of Mr. Campbell convince me that there has been a change in the atmosphere of the City Temple, and yet not enough change to make the sinner feel very uncomfortable. Mr. Spurgeon's earnestness was intense and perhaps we should not expect it of all preachers. But it is essential to the best preaching—to really great preaching.

At times I was almost on the point of calling Mr. Campbell a great preacher.

J. P. Greene, Liberty, Mo.

The Inspiration of Our Faith. Sermons.

By John Watson, D. D., "Ian Maclaren." Published by A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York. 1905. Pp. 559.

Here are twenty-nine sermons, and you will want to read them every one. Need one say a word more? You may not believe all you read here, but you will find mental stimulus, and what is far more in a sermon, you will find spiritual inspiration. You will know yourself better and God. Life will be fuller and religion will mean more.

It is the custom now to name sermon volumes after the title of the first one in the book, and that fashion seems at first to be followed here. But it is only in the seeming, for the title in this case is truly the appropriate characterization of the whole set of sermons. They deal with the emotional side of the religion of the soul under the lead of the Christ. Our day is fortunate in the vigorous reassertion of the value and reliability of the "feelings" as the source, or at least the channel, of the highest knowledge and the best certainty. Dr. Watson in his earlier writings showed a mind weary of the dearth of a religion of dogma. It was natural for such a mind to seek relief in the license of criticism. But "Ian Maclaren" was already a man of the heart and the only message in the midst of his criticism that the world listened to was the clear call of all his work. Now he has found himself and the barren conceit of criticism is even more disgusting than the dearth of theological dogma. In this volume he

gives you no preface, for he speaks not for himself. The apostle of the heart calls to the message of the heart of God and shows the way of response. W. O. Carver.

VII. MISSIONS.

Religions of Mission Fields; As Viewed by Protestant Missionaries.

Published by the Student Volunteer Movement. 1905. Pp. X, 300, 12mo, cloth 50 cents, paper 35 cents.

There are ten chapters dealing with all organized religions with which Protestant missionaries have to do, including Judaism and Roman Catholicism. In each instance there is a good bibliography of both popular and scientific works. The authors have been chosen with an eye to experience and capacity to make use of it, and a certain uniformity of treatment, with personal diversity has been secured by the editing committee. For a practical, clear, working view of the religions as they are today no single small volume is equal to this one. One questions many of the generalizations of Dr. Richards concerning the Religion of the African and may not be in perfect accord with all conclusions of other writers. Yet the work is remarkably well done and is cast in a form easy to get. It is just the thing for study classes and for private reading. W. O. Carver.

Mohammed and the Rise of Islam.

By D. S. Margoliouth. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1905. Pp. XXVI and 481. Numerous illustrations.

This volume is one of the Heroes of the Nations series which these publishers are bringing out. Professor Margoliouth is known as a competent scholar and his selection for this volume is fully justified by the outcome. Full use is made of all the sources and of all the works of preceding writers. The author is cautious of conclusions where the evidence is conflicting or insufficient and where the interpretations differ, but he is not more timid

than scientific statement will require. He points out, on occasion, the bias and error of some of his predecessors in this field. He takes the view that Mohammed was a shrewd builder of empire. It is of Mohammed "as a great men, who solved a political problem of appalling difficulty" rather than as the founder of a great religion that this volume treats. Due regard is had for the part played by the religion in the solution of the problem, but it must be understood that the work is not primarily a study in religion. The work is well done and will be of great value to all students of Islam and of its Prophet. It is an interesting fact that recent students are returning to the older view that Mohammed was a deceiver in the claims of revelation, though the spirit of the charge is quite different from that of a century ago. Such is the attitude of this author. W. O. Carver.

Egypt Burma and British Malaysia.

By William Eleroy Curtis. Published by Fleming H. Revell Company. 1905. 400 Pp. Price $2.00 net.

Mr. Curtis' reputation makes necessary now only the announcement that he has produced a book of travel and it is taken for granted that it is of the first order in description and information. He has not yielded to the temptation, natural under the circumstances, to do careless work, though it must be admitted that a little more time and pains would sometimes meet appreciation in his readers.

In this volume three countries, to speak freely, are grouped for no other reason than that the author's convenience was thus suited. Egypt comes in for fullest and best treatment, occupying 250 pages. Burma gets fair consideration in 100 pages with six chapters, lacking logical relation or comprehensive combination, but touching matters of prime interest.

British Malaysia is a title to cover what remained of

a journey, though the author never grows uninteresting nor fails to inform.

The illustrations are of high quality.

W. O. Carver.

The Land of the Gods.

By Alice Mabel Bacon. Published by Houghton Mifflin & Company, 1905. Pp. 267. Price $1.50.

This volume is made up of ten stories setting forth characteristic Japanese superstitions. The legends of folk-lore and superstition are full of interest in themselves and are told with great charm and skill. No explantations are given and no theorizing—just the plain tales woven about living characters with all the thrill, and sometimes horror, of the utmost reality. It might readily be supposed that the author believes every word of the wierd stories with a faith surpassing that of the Japanese.

One would err if he inferred that belief in the superstitutions here set forth is universal in Japan, but an intelligent reader will find delight and learning in the volume.

W. O. Carver.

VIII. OLD TESTAMENT.

The Priestly Element in the Old Testament.

By William Rainey Harper. Revised and enlarged edition, 1905. Pages 292, 8vo. cloth; postpaid $1.25. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and New York.

This book is a delight to the eye in its orderly arrangement of general topics and sub-heads, its paragraphing, the use of different fonts of type, the employment of boldface type, italics and all other devices known to the printer's art. The pages have wide margins, on which the biblical references find a suitable place opposite the paragraphs to which they are related. Three valuable appendixes present lists of the more important words in the vocabulary of worship, classified lists of important books and a conspectus of the newer literature (since 1901) on

the priestly element. A fairly good index adds to the value of the volume.

The results of a quarter of a century of critical study of the Old Testament by a keenly analytic mind are embodied in this book. The author's skill in arrangement appears in every chapter. He is a past master in the art of making a dry subject interesting.

There are copious references to the literature on the various topics, the books and articles being arranged chronologically, and the literature in languages other than English being placed by itself. Practically all the best works of the radical school receive constant mention, and many books and articles by mediating critics; the conservative literature does not meet with equal favor, though on some topics it is given satisfactory citation.

In the preface the author indicates the foundation on which he builds his book: "The general results of modern historical criticism have been taken as a basis for the work, since it is only from the point of view of history that these subjects may now be considered intelligently. Each special topic connected with the general subject of the Priestly Element furnishes a beautiful illustration of the growth and development of Israelitish and Jewish thought under the controlling influence of a conception of God which became more and more pure with the advancing centuries." By " the general results of modern historical criticism" our author means substantially the views propagated by the Kuenen-Wellhausen-Stade school. Books and articles by scholars of the radical school receive most frequent mention in the literature on the various topics. In a good many details, however, Dr. Harper sides with the mediating critics, standing with Driver as against Cheyne, or with Dillmann as against Wellhausen.

It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the views of the radical critics are thoroughly anti-biblical. Kuenen had no hesitation in saying that his understanding of the Old Testament history differed widely from the

views entertained and enforced by the Old Testament writers. They united in the view that Moses was the great lawgiver through whom Jehovah gave not only the Ten Commandments but hundreds of precepts and regulations for the conduct of the sons of Israel. Modern divisive critics are largely agnostic with respect to the famous lawgiver; "as for this Moses we wot not what is become of him." Our author ascribes to Moses most practical use of the tent, or tabernacle; as to his part in announcing laws to Israel he has litttle to say. He holds that laws regulating worship and life were largely formulated, as well as executed, by the priests. "Legislation, therefore, in its stricter sense, was the function of the priests, rather than of the prophets or sages." The sacred writers in both the Old Testament and the New held that the law was given by Moses, one of the greatest of the prophets.

It is important for the Christian reader to note at the outset of any examination of the book under review that Dr. Harper does not take his stand beside the organs of revelation, the great religious leaders through whom God spoke to the Israelites; but rather among the masses of the people with their superstition and slowness of heart to apprehend the messages of the prophets. He seems to have as his center of interest the unspiritual masses; he will not leave them to breathe the purer air of the mountain tops on which the prophets stand. He wishes to write a history of the priestly element in Israel, regarded as one of the nations of antiquity. He tries to trace the history of Israel's religion as evolved from primitive semitic life and worship, and as influenced by the religious beliefs and customs of all the peoples with which at different periods Israel came into contact. The average Israelite with all his weaknesses and sins is the man whose evolution Dr. Harper seeks to describe. In the past, Christian writers have usually tried to trace the history of God's self-revelation through the religious leaders whom he raised up to guide the nation into higher knowledge of his

will. Dr. Harper does not confine his attention to the history of worship as approved by Jehovah, but describes the worship as practiced by the masses of the people. This explains the presence of paragraphs on sorcery and witchcraft in close connection with purer and approved modes of worship. It would seem that the author ought to have made it plain to the general reader that the Old Testament writers are in no wise responsible for the failure of the masses to surrender crass notions in exchange for the higher faith everywhere taught by the organs of revelation. It means little to us now that even as late as the days of Manasseh of Judah human sacrifices were offered in sight of Jehovah's temple; it would mean much for us to discover that Moses or Isaiah approved the horrid practice.

The plain reader of the Bible will probably feel a shock of surprise to find that the early Old Testament period closes shortly before 621 B. C., the middle period with the visit of Ezra to Jerusalem about the middle of the fifth century B. C., while the late period includes the early Maccabean history. The modern critical theory almost ignores the patriarchs, knows little of Moses, gets mere glimpses of the judges, and begins to reach historic ground only with Samuel and Saul.

Dr. Harper accepts the late dates commonly assigned by the Wellhausen school to the Old Testament writings; in two or three instances he would put a book half a century earlier than Wellhausen and Stade. The analysis into documents as formulated by our author is substantially that promulgated by the leading German and Dutch critics of the last thirty years. If the modern critical view of the Old Testament is true, the credit for the discovery must be given to avowed naturalistic scholars like Kuenen and Wellhausen; all that mediating scholars can hope to do is to improve the literary analysis in details, check up the historical criticism in the interest of a modified and somewhat more reverent view of the value of the sacred writings, and especially to preach the new view

to the Christian public, which is always tempted to rate the Old Testament as highly as Jesus and his apostles rated it.

The Constructive Bible Studies, edited by Professors Harper and Burton, of which the volume under review forms a part, are designed for use in Bible classes in colleges and theological seminaries. In the preface to a companion volume, Constructive Studies in the Prophetic Element in the Old Testament, President Harper says: "These studies are intended primarily for students in college and those in the theological seminary, but they will not be found too technical for more intelligent Bible classes in our best Sunday schools." On almost every page of both these manuals by Dr. Harper are questions that will put the feet of the average theological student into the air, to say nothing of the advanced pupils in the Sunday school. In order to find light on the difficult questions thrust into his face, the young theologian must turn to books and articles filled with the most radical speculations in the study of Comparative Religion; books that he is scarcely prepared to understand, and can by no means *test* in their fundamental assumptions; books that manufacture from an ounce of supposed fact a pound of unverifiable theory. Such books often overawe the honest student in his earlier researches and make him imagine that such erudite thinkers must be right, even when his heart protests against their conclusions and his judgment is not satisfied as to the cogency of the arguments brought forward. Before the sacred writers are subjected to a merciless cross-examination, they ought to be allowed to tell their story in their own way, and be treated as honest and intelligent witnesses. Most of the students in college and theological seminary have imperfect knowledge of the Bible story; they ought to hear the direct testimony of the historians and biographers, and read the prophetic and wisdom books as they have been preserved to us, before listening to searching and scathing cross-examination on the part of able ad-

vocates who believe that the witnesses are in a holy conspiracy to cover up some of the most important facts.

Of the many difficult speculative questions thrust upon the college student, take a few samples: "Note (1) the distinction between clean and unclean animals made in the narrative of the deluge, and consider (2) whether the words *unclean* and *sacred* may not be used synonymously; that is, was not the *unclean thing* (whether animal or person or object) something in connection with which 'a superhuman agency of a dangerous kind' was supposed to be acting, and which, therefore, was, from one point of view, sacred, from another, unclean? (3) whether this is not to be closely associated with the usage existing among many nations and called *taboo*." The student is sent for an answer to an article in the Encyclopedia Britannica and to W. R. Smith's difficult book on the Religion of the Semites.

The key to the critical position is the Book of Deuteronomy; if the addresses ascribed to Moses were really made by that great leader of Israel, the whole modern critical theory is on a foundation of sand; if Deuteronomy was composed shortly before 621 B. C., the so-called traditional view falls to the ground. Dr. Harper accepts the late date for Deuteronomy, and faces the question, Is not the book a forgery and fraud, if not written by Moses? In his able discussion of this question (pp. 164f.) the author raises some difficult questions: "(7) Whether Hilkiah in permitting the belief in the Mosaic authorship was really guilty of *delusion;* was it not rather *illusion?* (8) Whether the principle of illusion is not (a) necessary in all educational work; (b) practiced in the Old and New Testaments; (c) one of the greatest elements in the teaching of Jesus himself."

Did Jesus practice *illusion?* The only proof-text given for such a startling view is John 16:12, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Arithmetic first, then Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Analytical Geometry, Calculus; we are familiar

in all educational work with progress from lower to higher things, but where is the *illusion?* The Century Dictionary defines illusion as follows: "1. That which illudes or deceives; an unreal vision presented to the bodily or mental eye; deceptive appearance; false show." "2. In *psyschol.*, a false perception due to the modification of a true perception by the imagination; distinguished from false apeparances due to the imperfection of the bodily organs of sense, such as irradiation, and from hallucinations, into which no true perception enters." "3. The act of deceiving or imposing upon any one; deception; delusion; mockery."

If the Century is right in its definition, Jesus did not practice *illusion,* and it has no place in a sound educational method. Jesus said concerning the hope of a blessed immortality in God's house, "if it were not so, I would have told you." He was the most candid, genuine, fearless teacher the world ever saw.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Constructive Studies in the Prophetic Element in the Old Testament.

By William Rainey Harper. Pages 142, 8vo, cloth; postpaid $1.00. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and New York. 1905.

This book is a companion to the Priestly Element in the Old Testament by the same author. Dr. Harper says in the preface: "The plan rests upon two vital principles: (1) That the student, guided by the suggestions made, shall do his own thinking and reach results which at least in a measure may be called his own. No conscious effort has been put forth to control the exact development of his thought. (2) That the student shall do his own work upon the basis of the Scripture material; in other words, that he shall study the Bible, and not merely read what others have said concerning it." These are fine words; we cannot withhold our hearty indorsement of both these vital principles. But the program of work as here outlined does not put the Bible as it is in the hands of the

student, but a new book constructed by modern critics who have reversed much of the work of the Old Testament writers. The college student, while imagining that he was doing strictly original work, would almost inevitably imbibe the author's own views, tactfully suggested by questions, and taught fully in the books most prominently mentioned in the literature on the various topics. Is this an example of *illusion?*

Who that ever knew the lamented author could fail to admire his genius for teaching and administration? He did much to revive Hebrew and Old Testament studies, more than any other man of his generation; the more is the pity that he accepted so many of the results of a criticism that sets so low an estimate on much of the Old Testament.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

. . . A NOTABLE NEW BOOK . . .

THE PROPHETS AND THE PROMISE

By Willis Judson Beecher

Professor of Hebrew in the Auburn Theological Seminary

"It is just the book we all need," writes one minister, echoing numerous enthusiastic reviews.

$2.00 net—by Mail $2.20 THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO., NEW YORK

Back numbers of the Baptist Review and Expositor can be had of the following issues only: July, 1904; October, 1904; January, 1905; April, 1905; July, 1905; January, 1906. These will be sold at fifty cents apiece, or, if all six numbers are taken, at a dollar and a quarter for the whole number. Send a dollar and a quarter and get these six back numbers. The number is limited and the supply will soon be exhausted. If check is sent, add ten cents for collection.

Address:

BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR,

Norton Hall,

LOUISVILLE, KY.

On the Front of the Order

This is to be practical not a polem
Constructive, not Controversial.

1. Independence vs Interdependence
   a. magnify our unities & not divisi
   b. Grade our work. Illus. fr. Scho
      1. to in assoc'n & Convent.
      2. " " our gen work
         colport. S.S. miss. Dist
         miss. Evangl - see
         unity not by adhesive (pressed to
         by Elec. force) but by Cohesive (Mu
         attraction)

2. Aggressive not sedative
   see art. Herein on Hebrews

3. Re-emphasis of Earliest Con
   tractions - Essential Spirit - no
   Stereotyped forms - Cf. Hall's book -

What about the Leaflet Ch? Why not Young Men attend Ch? Why Working Pamphlet? Do not Emphasize Ch Organization Name in Deliverance?